This is a digitally signed Gazette, to verify click here.
https://rajpatra.hp.gov.in

राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

मंगलवार, 31 मार्च, 2026 / 10 चैत्र, 1947

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

LABOUR EMPLOYMENT & OVERSEAS PLACEMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171 002, the 8th January, 2026

No : LEP-E/1/2024.—In exercise of the powers vested under section 17 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of

awards of the following cases announced by the **Presiding Judge, Labour Court-**cum-**Industrial Tribunal, Shimla, H.P.** on the website of the Printing & Stationery Department, Himachal Pradesh *i.e.* **"e-Gazette":—**

Sl. No.	Case No.	Petitioner	Respondent	Section	Date of Award/ Orders
1.	Ref.71/2020	Ajay Bhatia	M/s D.B. Corp Ltd.	10	02-12-2025
2.	Ref.84/2024	Gunjan Kumar Mandal	M/s ACME Generics (P) Ltd.	10	02-12-2025
3.	Ref.26/2025	Vidya Kumari Sharma	M/s Micro Turner	10	02-12-2025
4.	Ref.266/2020	Layak Ram	M/s SSIPL Retail Ltd.	10	03-12-2025
5.	Ref.54/2025	Rajender Singh	M/s Aspire IIT and Medical Coaching Institute.	10	05-12-2025
6.	Ref.38/2022	Krishna Devi	Principal Gurukul International School, Solan.	10	06-12-2025
7.	Ref.05/2019	Gian Chand	M/s Medicef Pharma	10	08-12-2025
8.	Ref. 20/2022	Gian Chand	M/s Medicef Pharma	10	08-12-2025
9.	Ref.41/2025	Pankaj Kumar & Ors.	M/s Rich Products.	10	09-12-2025
10.	Ref.143/2025	Rajeshwari	M/s Charak Pharma (P) Ltd.	10	12-12-2025
11.	Ref.83/2019	Sanjay Thakur	Registrar, MMU, Solan	10	13-12-2025
12.	App.54/2019	Deepan	Registrar, MMU, Solan	2A	13-12-2025
13.	Ref.151/2025	Dhyan Singh	Registrar, MMU, Solan	10	13-12-2025
14.	Ref.147/2024	Manoj Sharma	M/s JHS Ltd.	10	13-12-2025
15.	Ref.75/2020	Deepak Kaushal	M/s Microtek Himachal Power Products.	10	13-12-2025
16.	Ref.152/2024	Bhim Yadav	Microtek Universal Power Products	10	13-12-2025
17.	Ref.24/2023	Naresh Bharti	M/d Delhivery Ltd.	10	13-12-2025
18.	Ref.64/2024	Randeep Singh	M/s SPT Ind Nahan	10	23-12-2025
19.	Ref.59/2024	Rajmal	M/s Exicom Tele Systems	10	30-12-2025
20.	Ref.198/2021	Janav Kumar	M/s Sweet India (P) Ltd.	10	31-12-2025

By order,

PRIYANKA BASU INGTY, IAS,
Secretary (Lab. Emp. & O.P.).

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-**LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 71 of 2020

Instituted on : 24-06-2020

Decided on : 02-12-2025

Ajay Bhatia, r/o Shakuntla Bhawan, Near Amit Apartment, House No. 352, Sunny Side, Solan, District Solan, H.P. ..*Petitioner*.

VERSUS

1. The Managing Director, M/S D.B. Corporation Limited, Plot No. 280, Sarkhej Gandhi Nagar Highway, Near YMCA Club, Makarba, Ahmedabad, Gujrat.

2. The Assistant General Manager (HR & Admin), Dainik Bhaskar, Regional Office, Plot No. 11-12, Ground Floor, Dakshin Marg, Sector-25D, Chandigarh-160036.

3. The State Editor, Dainik Bhaskar, Malbrow House, Near DPRO Office, Chotta Shimla-2, H.P. ..*Respondents*.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondents : Sh. Virender Chauhan, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether the demand raised vide application/demand notice dated 06-04-2019 (copy enclosed) by Sh. Ajay Bhatia, r/o Shakuntla Bhawan, Near Amit Apartment House No. 352, Sunny Side, Solan, District Solan, H.P. regarding verbal termination of his services w.e.f. 05-04-2019 after demanding wages and arrear of wages as per recommendations dated 11-11-2011 of the Majithia Wage Board by (1) the Managing Director, M/S D.B. Corporation Limited, Plot No. 280, Sarkhej Gandhi Nagar Highway, Near YMCA Club, Makarba, Ahmedabad, Gujrat. (2) the Assistant General Manager (HR & Admin), Dainik Bhaskar, Regional Office, Plot No. 11-12, Ground Floor, Dakshin Marg, Sector-25D, Chandigarh, 160036. (3) the State Editor, Dainik Bhaskar, Malbrow House, Near DPRO Office, Chotta Shimla-2, H.P., is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above worker is entitled to from the above employers/ management?"

2. The case was listed for the evidence of the petitioner for today, the petitioner has still not turned up, neither anyone else has appeared on his behalf, nor any witness is present nor any steps have been taken. This was the last opportunity granted to the petitioner for evidence but despite that neither the petitioner nor any evidence is present today in the Court. As such, workman/petitioner has remained *ex parte.*

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.—If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to lead any evidence in support of statement of claim and to argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor his counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that the termination of his services *w.e.f.* 05-04-2019 after demanding wages and arrear of wages as per recommendations dated 11.11.2011 of the Majithia Wage Board without complying with the provisions of the Act and, thus, illegal and unjustified. However, there is no evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman has not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 2nd day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla, (H.P.)

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 84 of 2024

Instituted on : 20-09-2024

Decided on : 02-12-2025

Gunjan Kumar Mandal, r/o Village Kaithpura, P.O. Barahat, Tehsil Barahat, District Banka, Bihar-813103. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The managing director M/S Acme Generics Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 115, HPSIDC Industrial Area Davni, P.O. Gurumajra, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondent : Sh. Ashok Kumar Thakur, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether termination of the services of Sh. Gunjan Kumar Mandal, r/o Village Kaithpura, P.O. Barahat, Tehsil Barahat, District Banka, Bihar-813103 by the managing director M/S Acme Generics Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 115, HPSIDC Industrial Area Davni, P.O. Gurumajra, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan, H.P. during October, without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what relief including reinstatement, seniority, amount of back wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management?"

2. The case was listed for appearance of the petitioner for today but, however, neither the petitioner nor his counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal, despite the case being called several times since morning. Hence, despite due notice of the date of hearing, the workman/petitioner had remained *ex-parte.*

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.—If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.—If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor his counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that the termination of his services during October, without complying with the provisions of the Act and, thus, illegal and unjustified. However, there is no evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. In this view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 2nd day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla, (H.P.)

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA

Reference Number : 26 of 2025

Instituted on : 22-03-2025

Decided on : 02-12-2025

Vidya Kumari Sharma, d/o Late Sh. Hari Ram, V.P.O. Kodakotia, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, Dsitrict Mandi, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The occupier/ Factory Manager, M/S Micro Turner, Unit-VI, Village Harraipur, Gurumajra, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondent : Sh. Dhiraj Kanwar, Advocate.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether termination of the services Smt. Vidya Kumari Sharma d/o Late Sh. Hari Ram, V.P.O. Kodakotia, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. by the occupier/ Factory Manager, M/S Micro Turner, Unit-VI, Village Harraipur, Gurumajra, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. w.e.f. 09-07-2024 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what relief including reinstatement, seniority, amount of back wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management?

2. Record of the conciliation has been received but no other alternative address of the petitioner is available in the record of the conciliation. Number of times notices have been issued to

the petitioner but the same have been returned back undelivered for want of complete and sufficient address.

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex-parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, she is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue her case.

8. In the instant case, the petitioner could not be served for wants of complete and correct address. Thus, there is nothing on record to establish that her services were terminated *w.e.f.* 09-07-2024 was without complying with the provisions of the Act.

9. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances and also keeping in view the fact that a reference cannot be dismissed in default, the present reference is as kept **sina-die** till the day

the petitioner can present in the Court and get file revives after filing appropriate application. Ordered accordingly.

Announced in the open Court today this 2nd day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla, (H.P.).

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA

Reference No. : 266 of 2020

Instituted on : 08-10-2020

Decided on : 03-12-2025

Layak Ram, s/o Sh. Madan Singh, r/o Village Danda, P.O. Rajpur, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, Distt. Sirmour, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The Occupier/ Factory Manager, M/s SSIPL Retail Ltd., Village Mehruwala (Bhagani), Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Simraur, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Shri Niranjan Verma, Advocate.

For the respondent : Shri Navlesh Verma, Advocate.

AWARD

The following reference was received for adjudication from the appropriate Government:—

"**Whether termination of the services of Sh. Layak Ram s/o Sh. Madan Singh, r/o Village Danda, P.O. Rajpur, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmour, H.P. by the management of M/s SSIPL Retail Ltd., Village Mehruwala (Bhagani), Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur (H.P.) *w.e.f.* 30-09-2019 after conducting domestic enquiry and without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what relief including reinstatement, back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above ex-worker is entitled to from the above employer/ management?"**

2. The facts as emerges from the statement of claim are that the petitioner was working as Assistant (Semi Skilled) with the respondent company since 2005, the old name of the respondent

company was Reviera Pentland Pvt. Ltd. and the services of the applicant were retrenched *w.e.f.* 2006 illegally and arbitrarily. The worker union of the factory of which the petitioner was the office bearer opposed the illegal Act of the company and with the intervention of the labour and conciliation officer a written agreement was arrived on 20-06-2007 between the workers union and the management. In this agreement it was agreed by the management of the company that the services of the petitioner and some other retrenched workers will be reinstated/ taken back on old service terms and conditions as and when the new plant of the company will start at Mehruwala. In the year of 2016 when the new plant of the company started in Mehruwala, the respondent management did not obey the compromise arrived between the parties on 20-06-2007. The petitioner thus was compelled to file a complaint before the Labour Officer Paonta Sahib. He also filed a case before the Ld. Court No. 1 Paonta Sahib and after the court order the petitioner was taken back on duty. On this count the respondent management got annoyed and tried to harass and threatened to oust from him the duty. Suspension letter dated 04-04-2019 and charge sheet dated 24-04-2019 were issued to the petitioner which were replied by him. The respondent management feeling dissatisfied with the reply ordered a domestic enquiry and an enquiry officer was appointed, who conducting the enquiry in hap hazard and partial manner. Enquiry officer did not afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner nor the petitioner was allowed to lead any evidence. Petitioner was even not allowed to assist him in the enquiry. The enquiry officer did not recorded the version of the petitioner and even the statements of the management witnesses who deposed in favour of the petitioner were also not recorded. Enquiry officer who is also lawyer of the respondent management acted in an arbitrary manner and against the principles of natural justice gave findings against the petitioner, without any evidence on record, cogent reason and law. After conducting partial and unjust enquiry the services of petitioner were terminated *w.e.f.* 30-09-2019. Petitioner raised demand notice on 16-11-2019. Conciliation was tried but compromise could not effected due to adamant attitude of the respondent management. It has been prayed by the petitioner that he be reinstated in service with continuity, full back wages and other consequential benefits.

3. Notice of this petition was sent to the respondent, in pursuance thereof, respondent filed reply whereby preliminary objections of maintainability, suppression of material facts, petitioner is trying to divert the main issue, respondent has acted in accordance with law and estopple were taken. On merits, though it was not disputed that the petitioner was working with the respondent but it was claimed that petitioner is trying to mix two different episodes and incidents in order to gain sympathy of this Court. It was not disputed that the petitioner was taken back in services in view of the compromise arrived between the parties on 20-06-2007, but it was disputed that petitioner was taken back in service on Court order. It was submitted that suspension letter and charge sheet were served upon to the petitioner and the same were replied by him. Respondent alleged that on 04-04-2019 while being on duty at 8.40 A.M. the petitioner took up fight with one Sh. Rajesh Chauhan and threatened him with his life. During the said incident Vinod Kumar and Joginder Kumar were also present who intervened in the matter. It was claimed that the petitioner was given due opportunity and he was duly accommodate in the enquiry. He was given fair chance of being heard. It was claimed that the petitioner is trying to mislead the Court by mixing the facts of old cases and the incidents with the present case. The termination of the petitioner is legal and valid which has been made after complying with the provisions of the Act. Enquiry officer after examining four witnesses and going through their statements, found that the petitioner had in deed misbehaved and committed actions which were highly deplorable and unbecoming of an employee in the respondent organization. After receiving the domestic enquiry report, second show cause

notice was issued. Reply to the said notice was filed by the petitioner but the same was found to be unsatisfactory and thus services of the petitioner were dismissed.

4. No rejoinder was filed.

5. On the pleadings, this Court formulated the following issues on 31-10-2022.

1. Whether the termination of the services of petitioner *w.e.f.* 30-09-2019, by respondent after conducing domestic enquiry and without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is illegal and unjustified? If yes, what relief the petitioner is entitled to? ..*OPP.*

2. Whether the claim petition is neither competent nor maintainable in the present form, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

3. Relief.

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. Besides having heard the learned Counsel for the parties, I have perused the entire case record carefully.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:—

Issue No. 1	:	Yes
Issue No. 2	:	No
Relief	:	Claim petition is allowed as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUE NO. 1

9. The onus to prove issue no. 1 is on the petitioner.

10. Coming to evidence led by the petitioner, petitioner has stepped into the witness box as PW-1 and led his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the petition. He also tender in evidence charge sheet Ex. PW-1/B, termination letter Ex. PW-1/C, reply to the charge sheet mark-PX-1, notice of 2-A mark-PX-2, second show cause notice mark-PX-3, settlement dated 20-06-2007 mark-PX-4 and reply to the second show cause notice mark-PX-5.

11. During cross-examination he stated that he was reengaged by the respondent on 02-03-2016 and he worked up till 04-04-2019. He denied that the on 04-04-2019 a quarrel took place between him and Rajesh, when he was on duty. He denied that the Vinod Kumar and Joginder Kumar intervened to stop the quarrel. He admitted that enquiry was held and he was found guilty in that enquiry, however he denied that he was given due opportunity to plead his version. He admitted that he had received the show cause notice dated 27-08-2019 mark-DX-1 and suspension letter mark-DX-2. He denied that his termination is legal and valid.

12. This is the entire evidence led by the petitioner.

13. In rebuttal, the respondent examined Shri Kant Kapil, as RW-1, who also tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. RW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the reply. He also tendered in evidence complaint Ex. RW-1/B, suspension letter Ex. RW-1/C, charge sheet Ex. RW-1/D, reply to the charge sheet Ex. RW-1/E, intimation letter Ex. RW-1/F, appointment of domestic enquiry office Ex. RW-1/G, second show cause notice Ex. RW-1/H, reply to the show cause notice Ex. RW-1/J, termination letter Ex. RW-1/K and agreement mark-RX-1.

14. During cross-examination, he admitted that the old name of respondent company was REVIERA Pentland Pvt. Ltd. He also admitted that in the year 2006 respondent company had retrenched the workers including petitioner. He showed ignorance that it was agreed upon in the agreement dated 20-07-2007 that the retrenched workers will be reinstated, when new plant of the company will start at Mehruwala, on old terms and conditions. He stated that new plant was set up at Mehruwala in the year 2010. He admitted that petitioner was not reinstated in the new plant. He further admitted that labour commissioner of HP had sent the execution petition before the Ld. Civil Judge Court No. 1 Paonta Sahib regarding the implementation of agreement and petitioner was reengaged by the respondent on the directions of Ld. Civil Judge Court No. 1 Paonta Sahib, on 02-01-2016. He admitted that no written consent of the petitioner was taken for appointment of the enquiry officer. He deposed that he was not associated in the domestic enquiry thus he cannot say that enquiry officer did not allow the petitioner to lead his evidence.

15. Respondent also examined Sh. Pankaj Vats, as RW-2, who also tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. RW-2/A, *vide* he deposed that he was working as Deputy Manager, SSIPL Retail Ltd., on 04-04-2019. There was a fight between Rajesh and Layak Ram in the premises of the company and at the time Vinod and Joginder were also present there. He further stated that petitioner is quarrelsome person and he had a scuffle with Rajesh Chauhan and threatened to kill him. Enquiry conducted against the petitioner is based upon true and correct facts. Termination of the petitioner is proper and justified.

16. During cross-examination, he deposed that he was working as a Deputy Manager in the Store. Petitioner was posted in Quality department. He had deposed before the factory management and enquiry officer regarding this quarrel. No FIR was registered in the matter.

17. Respondent also examined Sh. Rajesh Chauhan, as RW-3, who also tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. RW-3/A, *vide* which he deposed that petitioner is a quarrelsome person who took up fight with him and had threatened to kill him. He further deposed he was saved by Vinod and Joginder.

18. During cross-examination, he deposed that he is not a summoned witness. He further deposed that he was abused by the petitioner but admitted that petitioner had not given beatings to him. He deposed that at present he is working at Sara Industrial Area, Selaqui, Uttrakhand.

19. This is the entire evidence led by the respondent.

20. So far as the case of the petitioner is concerned, petitioner has taken the plea that he was employed with the respondent in the year 2005. He was office bearer of the union of factory and his services were retrenched in the year 2006 illegally and arbitrarily but later on there was an agreement between workers union and the management whereby it was agreed that the retrenched workers including the petitioner will be reinstated/ taken back at new plant of the company at Mehruwala. The petitioner has alleged that even after the plant was set up at Mehruwala, the respondent did not comply with the agreement, as such execution was filed before the Ld. Court No. 1 Paonta Sahib and petitioner was taken back on duty on Court orders. The case further set up by the petitioner is that due to this reason respondent had grudges against him, thus respondent issued suspension order and chargesheet and conducted a malafied partial enquiry which was against the principles of natural justice and thereafter terminated the services of the petitioner illegally.

21. On the other hand, respondent has taken the plea that petitioner is trying to mix two different episodes and the incidents. Since the petitioner had taken up quarrel with Sh. Rajesh Chauhan (RW-3) enquiry was conducted in the matter and enquiry officer had found the petitioner guilty and thereafter second show cause notice was issued to the petitioner and reply to the same was filed by him but respondent management was not satisfied with the reply of the petitioner thus services of the petitioner were terminated/ dismissed. Though, the respondent has examined three witnesses and has tried to establish on record that the petitioner had quarrel with RW-3 and in this regard enquiry was conducted which was fair and proper but respondent has not bothered to examine the enquiry officer. The enquiry proceedings have not been placed on record, nor the enquiry officer has been examined to establish on record that a fair and proper enquiry was conducted or that due opportunities of being heard was granted to the petitioner. On the basis of RW-1 to RW-3 it cannot be held that the enquiry conducted by the respondent was fair and proper and the same was conducted as per the principles of natural justice. Since, the enquiry officer has not been examined nor the enquiry proceedings have been produced on record, thus this Court has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the services of the petitioner have been terminated illegally by the respondent. Accordingly, the dismissal order dated 30-09-2019 is set aside and quashed.

22. Now, the last question which has been raised by the petitioner through this claim petition is that he is not only entitled for reinstatement with seniority and continuity but also for back-wages. The petitioner in his affidavit Ex. PW-1/A has averred that he is not gainfully employed and after his termination his family is on the verge of starvation as he is the only bread earner in the family. It is settled that the entitlement of any employee to get re-instated does not necessarily and mechanically result in payment of full or partial back-wages which is independent of re-instatement and host of factors like the manner and method of selection and appointment, nature of appointment whether *ad-hoc*, short term, daily wage, temporary and permanent in character and length of service, which the workman had rendered with the employer, are required

to be taken into consideration before passing any order for award of back-wages. This position was reiterated in **Kanpur Electricity Supply C. Ltd. Vs. Shamim Mirza (2009) 1 SCC 20** as well as in **Ritu Marbles Vs. Prabhankant Shukla (2010) 2 SCC 70**.

23. In the case in hand the petitioner has shown that he was not gainfully employed anywhere. In **Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan Versus S.C. Sharma (2005) SCC 363**, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that in question of determining the entitlement of a person to back wages, the employee has to show that he/she was not gainfully employed. The initial burden is on the employee to prove that. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **National Gandhi Musuem Vs. Sudhir Sharma (2-21) 12 SCC 439** has considered this aspect and held as under:—

> **"Whether an employee after dismissal from service was gainfully employed is something, which is within his special knowledge. Considering the principle incorporated in Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act, the initial burden is on the employee to come out with the case that he was not gainfully employed after the order of termination. It is a negative burden, however, in what manner the employee can discharge the said burden will depend upon peculiar facts and circumstances of each case. It all depends on the pleadings and evidence on record. Since it is a negative burden, in a given case, an assertion on oath by the employee that he was unemployed, may be sufficient compliance in the absence of any positive material brought on record by the employer."**

24. Coming to the case in hand, it stands established that the petitioner was engaged as Assistant (semi-skilled) in the year 2005 and he worked uptill 30-09-2019, when his services were illegally dismissed by the respondent. Petitioner has worked about fourteen years with the respondent continuously as such in view of the continuous service which has been rendered by the petitioner with the respondent and in view of the fact that petitioner has discharged the initial burden put on his to show that he is not gainfully employed anywhere and this burden has not been rebutted by the respondent it stands established on record that the petitioner is not gainfully employed after his dismissal as such he is also entitled to full back-wages.

25. Keeping view the aforesaid discussion, the petitioner is held entitled for reinstatement with seniority and continuity along-with full back-wages. The dismissal order dated 30-09-2019 is hereby set aside and quashed. Accordingly issue no. 1 decided in favour of the petitioner.

ISSUE NO. 2

26. So far as issue No. 2 is concerned, the respondent has not led any evidence to establish on record that as to how the present claim petition is not maintainable. Moreover, the present claim petition has been filed by the petitioner pursuant to the reference received from the appropriate government for adjudication. I find nothing wrong with this petition which is perfectly maintainable in the present form. The issue no. 2 in question is answered in negative.

RELIEF

27. As a sequel to my findings on issues no. 1 & 2, the claim filed by the petitioner succeeds and is hereby partly allowed. The respondent management is directed to re-instate the petitioner *w.e.f.* 30-09-2019 with seniority and continuity, with full back-wages.

28. Let a copy of this award be communicated to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. The file after due completion be tagged with the main case file.

Announced in the open Court today on this 3rd day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla, (H.P.).

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
H.P. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 54 of 2025

Instituted on : 16-07-2025

Decided on : 05-12-2025

Rajender Singh, s/o Sh. Mangat Ram, c/o Sh. Subash Pathania Advocate, Ram Niwas Old Beer Khana, Shimla, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

Yoginder Kumar Meena (Managing Director), M/S Aspire IIT and Medical Coaching Institute, Near HDFC Bank BCS, New Shimla, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondent : Ms. Muskan Gupta, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether termination of the services of Sh. Rajender Singh, s/o Sh. Mangat Ram, c/o Sh. Subash Pathania Advocate, Ram Niwas Old Beer Khana, Shimla, H.P., by Sh. Yoginder Kumar Meena (Managing Director), M/S Aspire IIT and Medical Coaching Institute, Near HDFC Bank BCS, New Shimla, H.P. w.e.f. 20.11.2022 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as alleged by the workman, is legal and justified? If not, what relief of reinstatement, seniority, amount of back wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above managements?"

2. The case was listed for appearance of the parties for today but, however, neither the petitioner nor his counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal, despite the case being called

several times since morning. Hence, despite due notice of the date of hearing, the workman/petitioner had remained *ex-parte*.

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

> *"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".*

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

> *"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."*

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

> *"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.—If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."*

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

> *"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."*

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex-parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor his counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex-parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that the termination of his services *w.e.f.* 20-11-2022 was without complying with the provisions of the

Act and, thus, illegal and unjustified. However, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman had not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 5th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla, (H.P.).

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
H.P. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA, CAMP AT SOLAN**

Reference No : 38 of 2022

Instituted on : 14-02-2022

Decided on : 06-12-2025

Krishna Devi w/o Shri Virender Mohan r/o Koti, P.O. Galang, Tehsil & District Shimla, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The Director/Principal, Gurukul International Senior Secondary School, Bye Pass, Kather, Tehsil and District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Shri Neeraj Mehta, Advocate

For the respondent : Shri Alok Bhardwaj, Advocate

AWARD

The following reference was received for adjudication from the appropriate Government:—

"**Whether the transfer of Smt. Krishna Devi w/o Shri Virender Mohan r/o Koti, P.O. Galang, Tehsil & District Shimla, H.P. by the Director/ Principal, Gurukul**

International Senior Secondary School, Bye Pass, Kather Tehsil & District Solan, H.P. from her present Solan place of posting to Gurukul International Senior Secondary School, Kunihar, without serving prior notice of change in service conditions and without complying with the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, to what benefit and compensation the aggrieved workman is entitled from the above employer?"

2. The facts which emerges from the statement of claim are that the petitioner/workman was employed as Nanny (caretaker of babies) by the respondent School since 2011 to 2020 on monthly salary of Rs. 6700/-. Though, the work and performance of the petitioner was satisfactory as no chargesheet or warning was issued to her, but the principal of the respondent school, supervisor and Director ordered the petitioner to work in their residences in the pay she was getting to work in the School. Petitioner denied to work at the residences of these officials, then she was abused and humiliated and was threatened to be transferred to some other branch or that her services would be terminated. The petitioner was getting treatment from EIS Dispensary and thereafter from NAV Jeevan nursing Home and in this regard she had intimated the principal of the school and also moved an application for leave, but her application was not received by the Principal. Respondent transferred the petitioner to Kunihar Branch *vide* letter dated 08-10-2020 whereby she was directed to join at Kunihar Branch on 16-10-2020. On 15-10-2020, petitioner applied for medical leave to Principal of the respondent School at Kuther (Solan), but her application was not received by stating that she has been transferred to Kunihar and she shall apply for the medical leave at Kunihar branch. Petitioner has claimed that at the time of her appointment, no other branch of the school existed and she had been appointed to work at Gurukul International School Solan. The terms and condition of transfer was also not mentioned at the time of appointment of the petitioner. Petitioner is single mother of girl child and any adverse transfer will affect the studies of her daughter. Transfer has been ordered just to create a situation for the petitioner to resign from job or her services could be terminated for non-compliance of transfer order. The respondent has not followed the principles of natural justice. Petitioner could not join her duties at transferred place and she remained unemployed. Petitioner has no source of income, thus petitioner has prayed for her re-engagement at Solan branch with full back-wages and continuity in service from the date of her transfer.

3. Notice of this claim was sent to the respondent, in pursuance thereof respondent contested the claim by filing reply, wherein preliminary objections of maintainability, estoppel, petitioner while working in the School refused the work assigned by the superiors and when she was asked to do her duties she talked disrespectfully, in unparliamentarily language, spoke to her superiors by using abusive language and sarcastic comments. On 04-06-2020 the petitioner misbehaved with the coordinator of the school Smt. Sunita Thakur when she asked the petitioner to sign the letter. The petitioner not only refused to sign the letter, but also stated in loud voice that do whatever she wants to do, in front of the employees, other staff members and teachers of the school. Management issued warning letter to the petitioner on 9-6-2020, but the attitude of the petitioner remained the same and she again and again did serious misconducts in the school premises in front of the employees, teachers, staff and students of the school. It was further averred that the petitioner has not complied with the transfer orders dated 6-10-2020 and she has not joined her duties at Kunihar school till date. Respondent management wrote several letters to the petitioner to join her services at Kunihar, but in vain, the petitioner abandoned her services at her

own sweet will and never joined her services at Kunihar School till date. The school has two branches i.e. one is situated at Solan city and another is situated at Kunihar town, as such the school management has right to transfer its employees or staff from one branch to another. It was reiterated that the petition is neither competent nor maintainable. On merits, though it was not denied that the petitioner was employed as Nany as claimed by her, but reiterated that on 4-6-2020 and 6-6-2020, the petitioner misbehaved with her superiors and thereafter warning letter dated 9-6-2020 was issued. It was denied that the petitioner had informed the principal of the school regarding medical leave or moved any application for leave. It was disputed that petitioner could not joined at Kunihar Branch and remained unemployed. A false story has been cooked up by the petitioner, with motive to extort pecuniary benefits from the respondent and prayed for the dismissal of the claim.

4. Rejoinder to the reply was filed by the petitioner in which she denied the preliminary objections and reiterated the averments as made in the petition.

5. On the pleadings, this Court formulated the following issues on 07-01-2023

1. Whether the transfer of petitioner from her present Solan place of posting to Gurkul International Sr. Sec. School Kunihar, without serving prior notice of change in service conditions and without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947 is illegal and unjustified? If yes, what relief the petitioner is entitled to? ..*OPP*.

2. Whether the claim petition filed by the petitioner is neither competent nor maintainable in the present form, as alleged? ..*OPR*.

3. Relief.

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. I have heard the Ld. Counsel for the parties and have also gone through the record with care.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:—

Issue No. 1	: Yes. Entitled to reinstatement with seniority and continuity along-with full back-wages.
Issue No. 2	: No.
Relief	: Reference is answered in affirmative as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUE NO. 1

9. The onus to prove issue no.1 is on the petitioner

10. Coming to evidence led by the petitioner, petitioner stepped into the witness box as PW-1 and led her evidence by way of affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the petition.

11. During cross-examination, she deposed that she was engaged for stitching work. She denied that she refused to do the work allotted to her and further denied that she used to speak in abusive language and made sarcastic remarks to her superiors. She denied that she misbehaved with Sunita Thakur on 4-6-2020 and refused to sign and further denied that she used abusive language about the Direcor and Principal on 6-8-2020. She deposed that she had not received any warning letter from the school on 09-06-2020. She denied that *vide* office order dated 9-8-2020, she was fined `2,000/-. She admitted that letter dated 11-8-2020 has been written by her. She denied that she extended threat to commit suicide along-with her daughter on 7-8-2020. She admitted that respondent school has branches at Solan, Kandaghat and Kunihar. She admitted that she was transferred *vide* transfer letter dated 6-8-2020. She admitted that she was asked to join on 1-12-2020 vide letter dated 25-10-2020. She admitted that till date she has not joined her duties at Kunihar. She deposed that she cannot join duty at Kunihar, as she is a single parent of a girl child. She denied that she has abandoned the job herself. She further denied that she is gainfully employed.

12. Shri Hem Raj was examined by the petitioner as PW-2, who led his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. PW-2/A, wherein he deposed that he worked as security guard with respondent school from 2019 to August 2022 and he knows the petitioner who worked as a nanny with the respondent. He further deposed that in his presence principal Smt. Gurpreet Mathur, Director Shri Sunil Garg and Shri Dinesh Garg used to take the work of cook and sweeper from the petitioner in their private houses and when the petitioner refused to do the work, she was transferred to Kunihar Branch.

13. During cross-examination, he deposed that he has not produced any document regarding his appointment. He admitted that he was also a witness in reference no. 146 of 2022. He denied that he had left the job at his own, but stated that he has not raised any dispute.

14. This is the entire evidence led by the petitioner

15. In order to rebut the evidence of the petitioner, respondent examined Shri Luckhvinder Arora, as RW-1, who also led his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. RW-1/A, which is reproduction of the averments as made in the reply.

16. During cross-examination, he deposed that he is working as Principal in the respondent School since Jan., 2022. He deposed that he has not placed on record any file regarding work & conduct of the petitioner. He further stated that Shri Dinesh Garg Director is hale and hearty**.** Worker of group D can be deputed to work there in the residences of Director and Principal, which are situated in the school premises.

17. The other witness examined by the respondent is Ms. Sunita Tomar, Supervisor of respondent school, who stepped into the witness box as RW-2 and led her evidence by way of affidavit Ex. RW-2/A. She also placed on record letter dated 26-05-2020 as Ex. RW-2/B, warning

letter dated 09-06-2020 as Ex. RW-2/C, office order dated 07-08-2020 as RW-2/D, transfer letter dated 06-10-2020 as Ex. RW-2/E, letter dated 25-10-2020 Ex. RW-2/F and letter dated 11-12-2020 Ex. RW-2/G.

18. During cross-examination, she admitted that letters Ex. RW-2/C to Ex. RW-2/G and document Mark A have been signed by former Principal Smt. Gurmeet Mathur. She further showed ignorance whether any other person except petitioner was transferred to other school. She deposed that the petitioner used do cleaning, dusting work etc. She denied that the petitioner was engaged for stitching work.

19. Ms. Simran Thakur, Front Executive Officer appeared into the dock as RW-3, who led her evidence by way of affidavit Ex. RW-3/A which is also a reproduction of the averments as made in the reply.

20. During cross-examination, she deposed that petitioner used to work as nanny. She deposed that the work of nanny was of cleaning and dusting of the office, but the petitioner refused to do the cleaning work. She showed ignorance that when the petitioner refused to work in the house of Director, she was transferred to Kunihar. She admitted that documents Ex. RW-2/B to Ex. RW-2/G and document Mark A have been signed by Smt. Gurmeet Mathur, former principal of the school.

21. This is the entire evidence led by the respondent

22. So far as the claim of the petitioner is concerned, the petitioner has claimed that she worked as nanny with the respondent school which fact has not been disputed by the respondent. It is also not disputed that the petitioner was engaged as Nanny since 2011 and worked till 2020 and was getting salary of `6700/- per month. The petitioner has alleged that she was forced to do house hold works in the house of Director and other officials of the School which she refused to do and due to this reason she was transferred to Kunihar Branch of the respondent school without there being any stipulation of transfer in her the appointment letter, in utter violation of the mandatory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter to be referred as the Act) whereas the respondent has taken the plea that the petitioner while working in the school refused to do the work assigned to her by her superiors and whenever she was asked to do her duties, she used to talk disrespectfully by using unparliamentarily and abusive language. It is further the plea of respondent that a show cause notice was issued to the petitioner and thereafter she was transferred to Kunihar Branch, but she did not join her duties at transferred place and as such she abandoned the job herself. So far as these allegations and counter allegations are concerned, no appointment letter has been produced by either of the parties nor the respondent has produced on record any By-laws of the respondent school to establish on record that the respondent school had right to transfer the petitioner to its other branch. The petitioner has taken a very specific plea that at the time of her appointment there was no stipulation that her services could be transfer, as such, onus was heavily on the respondent to prove on record that they could transfer the services of the petitioner to the other branch of the respondent school at Kunihar, in view of the stipulation in the appointment letter or under the clause(s) of the By-laws of the school. Since, neither the appointment letter has been produced nor any By-laws have been produced by the respondent, it is to be presume that there was no clause of transfer either in the appointment letter or under the By-laws of the respondent school to transfer the petitioner to its other branch.

23. Though, the respondent has taken the plea that the petitioner was disobedient and she was not following the commands of her superiors and had also misbehaved with school coordinator and principal, but neither any chargesheet has been issued to the petitioner nor any enquiry has been conducted against her to prove such allegations. From the record, it appears that the

respondent school chose to transfer the petitioner to some other branch without there being any stipulation for transfer of the petitioner in the appointment letter or in the By-laws.

24. In view of the discussion made above, it stands established that the transfer order of the petitioner has been issued to her in utter violation of the mandatory provisions of the Act as no notice of change of service conditions has been issued to the petitioner.

25. Though, at the time of arguments, Ld. counsel for the respondent had taken the plea that respondent has not terminated the services of the petitioner but she has abandoned the job at her own by not joining the duties at transferred place and remained absent. So far as this plea of abandonment is concerned, neither any enquiry has been conducted nor opportunity of being heard was afforded to the petitioner before or after transferring her to some other branch. It is well known that abandonment has to be proved by the employer like any other fact. Therefore, the burden of proving of abandonment is upon the respondent. It has been laid down by our own Hon'ble High Court in case titled as ***Narain Singh vs. The State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors., 2016 (3) Him L.R. 1875*** that voluntary abandonment of work by a workman is required to be established by way of cogent and reliable evidence by the employer. Similarly, in case titled as ***State of Himachal Pradesh & another vs. Shri Partap Singh, 2017 (1) Him L.R. 286***, it has been held by our own Hon'ble High Court that abandonment is not to be lightly presumed, but it has to be unequivocally proved by the employer. Simply because a workman fails to report for duty, it cannot be presumed that he/she has left/abandoned the job.

26. Admittedly, no disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the petitioner by the respondent for her alleged willful absence from duty after transferring her to some other branch. Absence from duty is a serious misconduct and the principle of natural justice did require that some sort of a fact finding inquiry was got conducted by the respondent. In the present case as it emerges from the evidence on record, so was not done by the respondent. Then, '*animus'* to abandon, it is well settled, must necessarily be shown to exist, before a case of abandonment can be said to have been made out. No evidence of any such '*animus'* on the part of the petitioner is forthcoming in the present case. Thus, the plea of abandonment put forth by the respondent/employer is not established. There is no strength in the plea taken by the respondent that the petitioner has abandoned the job.

27. At the time of arguments, it was argued that at no point of time the respondent has not terminated the services of the petitioner as such there is no official termination of the petitioner which could be set aside. So far as this plea of respondent is concerned, admittedly the respondent vide letter dated 6-10-2020 Ex. RW-2/E, transferred the petitioner and she was asked to join the duties at Kunihar on 16.10.2020. In Ex. RW-2/E no date of joining has been mentioned, however, in letter dated 25-10-2020 Ex. RW-2/F, it is mentioned that the petitioner was to join her duties on 16-10-2020, but since the petitioner was un-well, she was directed to join her duties at Kunihar on 01-12-2020. Therefore chargesheet Ex. RW-2/G was issued to the petitioner, but there is nothing on record that when this chargesheet was served on the petitioner and thereafter what action was taken on this chargesheet by the respondent. Admittedly no enquiry has been conducted in the matter by the respondent. Since, the plea of the respondent is that the petitioner has abandoned the job which plea has not been proved in accordance with law it tantamount to oral termination of the petitioner by the respondent. It has already been held by this Court that transfer of the petitioner from Solan to Kunihar branch is not supported either by her appointment letter or By-laws as such the same is violative of the principles of natural justice.

28. In view of my foregoing discussion, it is held that the transfer of petitioner by the respondent from Solan to Kunihar branch without serving prior notice of change in service conditions and without complying with the mandatory provisions of the Act is illegal and

unjustified. The petitioner is held entitled to be reinstated in service on the same post and place where she was working prior to her transfer i.e. **at Gurukul International Senior Secondary School, Kather Bye Pass, Solan, H.P. with seniority and continuity.**

29. Now, the last question which has been raised by the petitioner through this claim petition is that she is not only entitled for reinstatement with seniority and continuity but also for back-wages. The petitioner in her statement of claim as well as by way of affidavit Ex. PW-1/A the petitioner has averred that she is unemployed since the date of her termination. It is settled that the entitlement of any employee to get re-instated does not necessarily and mechanically result in payment of full or partial back-wages which is independent of re-instatement and host of factors like the manner and method of selection and appointment, nature of appointment whether ad-hoc, short term, daily wage, temporary and permanent in character and length of service, which the workman had rendered with the employer, are required to be taken into consideration before passing any order for award of back-wages. This position was reiterated in **Kanpur Electricity Supply C. Ltd. Vs. Shamim Mirza (2009) 1 SCC 20** as well as in **Ritu Marbles Vs. Prabhankant Shukla (2010) 2 SCC 70**.

30. In the case in hand the petitioner has shown that she was not gainfully employed anywhere. In **Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan Versus S.C. Sharma (2005) SCC 363**, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that in question of determining the entitlement of a person to back wages, the employee has to show that he/she was not gainfully employed. The initial burden is on the employee to prove that. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **National Gandhi Musuem Vs. Sudhir Sharma (2-21) 12 SCC 439** has considered this aspect and held as under:—

> **"Whether an employee after dismissal from service was gainfully employed is something, which is within his special knowledge. Considering the principle incorporated in Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act, the initial burden is on the employee to come out with the case that he was not gainfully employed after the order of termination. It is a negative burden, however, in what manner the employee can discharge the said burden will depend upon peculiar facts and circumstances of each case. It all depends on the pleadings and evidence on record. Since it is a negative burden, in a given case, an assertion on oath by the employee that he was unemployed, may be sufficient compliance in the absence of any positive material brought on record by the employer."**

31. Coming to the case in hand, it stands established that the petitioner was engaged as Nanny by the respondent in the year 2011 and she worked up till the year 2020, when her services were illegally transferred by the respondent without serving prior notice of change in service conditions and without complying with the mandatory provisions of the Act. Petitioner has worked about nine years with the respondent school continuously as such in view of the continuous service which has been rendered by the petitioner with the respondent and in view of the fact that petitioner has discharged the initial burden put on her to show that she is not gainfully employed anywhere and this burden has not been rebutted by the respondent it stands established on record that the petitioner is not gainfully employed after her oral termination as such she is also entitled to full back-wages and accordingly issue No.1 is answered in favour of the petitioner.

ISSUE NO. 2

32. Now coming to issue no. 2, there is nothing on record that as to how this petition is neither competent nor maintainable. The present reference petition has been sent to this Court by the appropriate Government for adjudication and the same is maintainable before this Court, hence, issue no. 2 decided against the respondent.

RELIEF

33. In view of my aforesaid discussion, the claim filed by the petitioner succeeds and is hereby allowed. The respondent school is directed to re-engage the petitioner in service forth-with with seniority and continuity along-with full back-wages on the same post and place where she was working prior to her transfer i.e. **Gurukul International Senior Secondary School, Kather Bye Pass, Solan, H.P**. The respondent school is directed to pay the back-wages within a period of two months from the date of announcement of this award failing which the same shall carry interest @ 9% per annum. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

34. Let a copy of this award be communicated to the appropriate Government for publication in the official Gazette. The file after due completion be tagged with the main case file.

Announced in the open Court today on this 6th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla, (H.P.)

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE,
H.P. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 05 of 2019

Instituted on : 01-01-2019

Decided on : 08-12-2025

Gian Chand, s/o Shri Mohan, Village Chamukha, P.O. Sehli (Harabagh), Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The Managing Director, M/S Medicef Pharma, Plot No. 28, Phase-1, Village Jharmajri, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Shri Narender Verma, Adv.

For the Respondent : Sh. Rajeev Sharma, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"**Whether demands of Shri Gian Chand, s/o Shri Mohan, Village Chamukha, P.O. Sehli (Harabagh), Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. raised vide demand**

notice dated 23-06-2018 (copy enclosed) before the Labour Officer Baddi and the Managing Director, M/S Medicef Pharma, Plot No. 28, Phase-1, Village Jharmajri, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. are legal and justified? If yes, what relief the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management?"

2. The case of the petitioner, as it emerges from the statement of claim is that he is a workman as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred as the Act) and was engaged as store supervisor in Storage Department of the respondent company *w.e.f.* 20-05-2011 and had worked as such till 14-06-2018. Neither increments in parity with other workers have been given to him nor he was promoted. Workmen junior to him were getting periodic increments and their salaries/wages were also on higher side. As the petitioner while doing his duty had found discrepancies in the entries of detail of stock and had reported the same to the Head of Factory through e-mails, the Maintenance Manager, Purchase Manager and official of the HR Department got annoyed and had hatched a conspiracy to harass him financially, mentally and physically. Even, his wages and monetary benefits were reduced and he was not granted leave during the pregnancy of his wife, who as such could not get proper medical care. Due to receipt of letter sent by the respondent by his wife she got depressed and due to this the child in her womb got aborted. Petitioner has claimed that he was not granted the promotion and other increase in the salary/wages and was paid increment less than other similar situated workers/employees and when he made a request for promotion, increase in monetary benefits etc., he was suspended vide suspension letter dated 14-06-2018 and false charges were levelled vide chargesheet dated 04-07-2018. He filed reply to the suspension and chargesheet, but of no avail. Respondent company has adopted inimical attitude towards the petitioner and levelled false allegations against the petitioner. Due to discrimination of the petitioner by the respondent company, the petitioner is on the verge of starvation as he has no source of income. The unlawful dismissal of the petitioner by the respondent company itself is victimization by way of adopting unlawful means. Petitioner raised demand notice before the Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer in which the respondent company was duly served, however, due to adamant attitude of the respondent company, the conciliation proceedings failed and the matter was sent to this Court as reference for adjudication. The petitioner has prayed that the dismissal order dated 31-10-2018 be set aside and he be reinstated in service with all the consequential service benefits including full back-wages. Petitioner further prayed that his demands be allowed. The claim is duly supported with the affidavit of petitioner.

3. Notice of this claim was sent to the respondent and in pursuance thereof the petition was contested by the respondent by filing reply wherein the respondent took preliminary objections regarding lack of maintainability, concealment of material facts, the petitioner is not a workman as he was appointed as a supervisor and that the reference is not a legal one. By asserting an additional plea, the respondent has contended that during the course of his employment, the petitioner had indulged in grave misconduct, hence an independent, fair and impartial enquiry into the misconduct was got conducted by an independent person. The enquiry officer conducted the enquiry as per the principles of the natural justice by affording full opportunity to attend the same, but the petitioner had failed to attend the enquiry proceedings on trifle matters and as such the enquiry officer had proceeded him ex-parte. The petitioner is stated to be gainfully employed and earning more than the amount which he was earning from the respondent. On merits, it is admitted that the petitioner was appointed on the post of Supervisor (Engineering Store) on 02.04.2012 at a monthly salary of Rs. 8,000/-. It was enhanced from time to time and at the time of his dismissal the petitioner was being paid Rs. 19,500/- per month. The duties assigned to him were purely supervisory in nature, hence the provisions of the Act are not attracted in this case. The petitioner had been insisting to be promoted as Manager/ Assistant Manager (Engineering Store), but the respondent refused as there was no post of Manager Engineering Store. It is denied that the salary of the petitioner was on the lower side. It is admitted that the suspension order and charge-sheet were served upon the

petitioner. A Civil Suit for recovery of damages for wrongful termination in the Court of Senior Civil Judge, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. has been filed by the petitioner against the respondent, on the same cause of action. After adopting the legal recourse, his services were rightly dismissed by the respondent. By denying the other allegations, the respondent has prayed for the dismissal of the claim petition.

4. While filing the rejoinder, the petitioner controverted the averments made in the reply and reiterated those in the statement of claim.

5. Out of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for determination and adjudication by this Court, vide order dated 23-08-2021:—

1. Whether the demand raised by demand notice dated 23-06-2018 to be fulfilled by the management are legal and justified? ..*OPP*.

2. If issue no.1 is proved in affirmative then what relief petitioner is entitled to? ..*OPP*.

3. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable in the present form? ..*OPR*.

RELIEF

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. Besides having heard the Ld. Counsel for the parties, I have also gone through the record of the case carefully.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues, my findings thereon are as under:—

Issue No. 1	: Redundant.
Issue No. 2	: Redundant.
Issue No. 3	: Yes.
Relief	: Reference is answered in the Negative, as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUE NO. 3

9. Issue no.3 is taken up first for determination as the main contention of the respondent at the time of filing reply as well as addressing arguments is that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as defined under Section 2-S of the Act.

10. Per the respondent, the petitioner at the time of dismissal was drawing salary of Rs. 19,500/- per month and was primarily performing supervisory duties, as such does not fall within the preview of "workman", as contemplated under Section 2(s) of the Act. As per the respondent the petitioner was appointed initially on 02.04.2012 as supervisor (Engineering Store) at a monthly salary of Rs. 8,000/- and his salary was enhanced from time to time. Thus, per the respondent the present reference is not maintainable as the petitioner does not fall within the definition of the "workman".

11. The petitioner no doubt has admitted that he was engaged in the store department of the respondent company as supervisor, and he was engaged on 20-05-2011. As per the petitioner, he squarely falls within the definition of "workman".

12. Now, coming to the evidence which has been led by the petitioner to prove his case, he has appeared into the witness box as PW-1 and tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the claim petition. The petitioner also tendered in evidence suspension letter dated 14-06-2018 Ex. PW-1/B, letter of change designation Mark PA Chargesheet Mark PB, demand letters Mark PC and Mark PD, e-mails Mark PE-1 to Mark PE-49 and demand notice Ex. PW-1/C. Documents Mark PX-1 to Mark PX-19.

13. During cross-examination, he denied that he joined as Engineering Supervisor Store on 2-4-2012. He admitted that vide detail increment sheet Ex. R-1, he was granted annual increments from time to time. He further admitted that the reply Ex. R-2 was filed by the respondent to demand notice dated 23-06-2018. He denied that he filed false complaints against the respondent with the Police. He admitted that the respondent issued chargesheet to him and enquiry was conducted against him. He further admitted that his services were terminated vide letter dated 31-10-2018 and he was paid a sum of Rs. 1,07,619/-. He admitted that he had filed a civil suit in the Court of Civil Judge Sunder Nagar claiming damages of Rs. 20 lakhs from the respondent.

14. The respondent on the other hand examined Shri Sanjay Jain as RW-1 who also tendered in evidence affidavit Ex. RW-1/A which is reproduction of averments as made in the reply.

15. During cross-examination this witness has admitted that the petitioner was appointed on 2-4-2012 on monthly wages of Rs. 19500/-. He deposed that the petitioner was appointed to the post of Store Supervisor and he used to supervise, prepare inventory and account all the material brought inside the factory through invoices. He denied that proper increment was not given to the petitioner. He further denied that the petitioner was wrongly chargesheeted. He also denied that the petitioner was subjected to physical, financial and mental torture. He denied that the services of the petitioner were terminated during the pendency of reference no. 20 of 2022.

16. It, thus, emerges from the facts on record that the petitioner admittedly was appointed in the storage department of the respondent company as Supervisor store. It is also admitted that the last drawn salary of the petitioner was around Rs. 19,500/-. The petitioner has admitted that since he was working as supervisor in the store and was discharging the duties which were supervisory in nature.

17. Before adverting any further, it would be apposite to venture into the legal aspect of the matter, as to whether the petitioner would fall within the terms of Section 2(s) of the Act. The Section read and under:—

> "*Workman" means any person (including an apprentice employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied, and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute, or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person-*
>
> *(i) who is subject to the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), or the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), or the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957); or*

(ii) who is employed in the police service or as an officer or other employee of a prison; or

(iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity; or

(iv) who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding one thousand six hundred rupees per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, function mainly of a managerial nature.

18. The definition itself stipulates as to who a workman would be. However, clauses-1 to IV are the exceptions, which have been carved out to say that the following would not fall within the category of a "workman" (in our case clauses- III and IV is relevant to be noticed). The bare reading of the Section shows that a person who is employed in a managerial or administrative capacity would not fall within the term of workman and the person who is employed in a supervisory capacity and draws wages exceeding `10,000/- per mensem and discharges functions mainly of a managerial or supervisory in nature would also not come within the purview of the term "workman".

19. Viewed in this context, the admissions made by the petitioner in his cross-examination shows that he had been assigned the duties which were primarily supervisory in nature and that his last drawn salary was Rs. 19,500/-. No doubt, the work or the job profile of the petitioner has not been brought on record by the respondent, but it is by now well settled that the admissions are the best piece of evidence. The admissions made by the petitioner, as discussed aforesaid would go to show that he was employed in the supervisory capacity and had been drawing wages exceeding Rs. 10,000/- mensem and that he had been assigned duties of supervisory nature.

20. Though, in determining the nature of work, the designation of the employee or the name assigned to him should not be given due importance. The primary duty performed by the person is to be given due importance but coming to the case in hand there is no evidence worth the name to suggest that the petitioner was doing any other duties except to supervise the work in the respondent company**. In Somnath Tulshi Ram Galande Vs. Presiding Officer, IInd Labour Court Pune and others 2008 (4) Mh.L.J 163, The Hon'ble Apex Court has held as under:—**

> **"Where a particular workman is a supervisor within or without the definition of "workman" is "ultimately a question of fact, at best one of mixed fact and law" and "will really depend upon the nature of the industry, the type of work in which he is engaged, the organizational set up of the particular unit of industry and the like factors."**

21. The Hon'ble High Court had come to record a finding in the aforesaid case that the appellant therein was undertaking supervisory and managerial work as such he was not covered under the definition of "workman".

22. Similarly, in **S.K. Maini Vs. Carona Sahu Co. Ltd., 1994 AIR 1824,** the Supreme Court has held as under:—

> **"After giving our careful consideration to the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the parties, it appears to us that whether or not an employee is a workman under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act is required to be determined with reference to his principal nature of duties and functions. Such question is required to be determined with reference to the facts and**

circumstances of the case and materials on record and it is not possible to lay down any straitjacket formula which can decide the dispute as to the real nature of duties and functions being performed by an employee in all cases. When an employee is employed to do the types of work enumerated in the definition of workman under Section 2(s), there is hardly any difficulty in treating him as a workman under the appropriate classification but in the complexity of industrial or commercial organizations quite a large number of employees are often required to do more than one kind of work. In such cases, it becomes necessary to determine under which classification the employee will fall for the purpose of deciding whether he comes within the definition of workman or goes out of it ...the designation of an employee is not of much importance and what is important is the nature of duties being performed by the employee. The determinative factor is the main duties of the employee concerned and not some works incidentally done. In other words, what is, in substance, the work which employee does or what in substance he is employed to do. Viewed from this angle, if the employee is mainly doing supervisory work but incidentally or for a fraction of time also does some manual or clerical work, the employee should be held to be doing supervisory works. Conversely, if the main work is of manual, clerical or of technical nature, the mere fact that some supervisory or other work is also done by the employee incidentally or only a small fraction of working time is devoted to some supervisory works, the employee will come within the purview of 'workman' as Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

The appellant in the present case had multifarious duties and most of his duties were supervisory and managerial. He had the power and capacity to take decisions, supervise work of others and was also responsible for quality control of the products being manufactured. The character and nature of his duties while seen in the light of the documentary and oral evidence led by the parties, it can be concluded that the appellant was not a 'workman' within the definition of Section 2(s) of the Act. Looking into the admission of the workman and specific language of Exhibit 29 and the terms and conditions of his appointment, it is difficult to arrive at any conclusion other than the one arrived at by the Labour Court and the learned single Judge in the impugned order."

23. Coming to the case in hand from the demand notice Ex. PW-1/C, it is clear that the first demand which the petitioner has raised through demand notice Ex. PW-1/C before the management of respondent is that his designation be changed to Engineer Store Manager and his salary, increment, bonus and all other benefits be given to him at par with other Manager Store. Had the petitioner being skilled of unskilled workers, he could not have claimed the benefits of Manager vide demand notice Ex. PW-1/C. The demand notice Ex. PW-1/C raised by the petitioner clearly established on record that the petitioner was working as Supervisor and not as workman. From the statement of claim as available on record, the petitioner has failed to make any averment that he was doing any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational and clerical work. The character and nature of his duties while seen in the light of the evidence as available on record it can be concluded that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as provided under Section 2(s) of the Act. Therefore, keeping in view the evidence as available on record there is no hesitation in the mind of the Court to come to the conclusion that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as provided under Section 2(s) of the Act. Accordingly, issue no. 3 is answered in favour of the respondent and against the petitioner.

ISSUES No. 1 & 2

24. Being interlinked and co-related both these issues are taken up together. Keeping in view my findings on issue no.3 above, both these issues become redundant.

RELIEF

25. As a Sequel to my above discussion and findings on issues no. 1 to 3, the claim filed by the petitioner fails and is hereby dismissed being not maintainable. Consequently, the present reference is answered in negative by holding that since the petitioner is not a workman, he is not entitled to any relief from this Court.

26. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication as per law. File be consigned to the record room after necessary compliance by Ahlmad.

Announced in the open Court today on this 8th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla, (H.P.)

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE,
H.P. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 20 of 2022

Instituted on : 14-01-2022

Decided on : 08-12-2025

Gian Chand, s/o Shri Mohan, Village Chamukha, P.O. Sehli (Harabagh), Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The Managing Director, M/S Medicef Pharma, Plot No. 28, Phase-1, Village Jharmajri, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the petitioner : Shri Rahul Singh, Advocate

For the Respondent : Sh. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"**Whether termination of the services of Shri Gian Chand, s/o Shri Mohan, Village Chamukha, P.O. Sehli (Harabagh), Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. by the Managing Director, M/S Medicef Pharma, Plot No. 28, Phase-1, Village Jharmajri, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. *w.e.f.* 31-10-2018 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what relief**

including reinstatement of the services, seniority, amount of back-wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management/employer?"

2. The case of the petitioner, as it emerges from the statement of claim is that he is a workman as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred as the Act). He was engaged as store supervisor in Storage Department of the respondent company *w.e.f.* 20-05-2011 and had worked as such till 14-06-2018. Neither increments in parity with other workers have been given to him nor he was promoted. Workmen junior to him were getting periodic increments and their salaries/wages were also on higher side. As the petitioner while doing his duty had found discrepancies in the entries of detail of stock and had reported the same to the Head of Factory through e-mails, the Maintenance Manager, Purchase Manager and official of the HR Department got annoyed and had hatched a conspiracy to harass him financially, mentally and physically. Even, his wages and monetary benefits were reduced and he was not granted leave during the pregnancy of his wife, who as such could not get proper medical care. On account of continuous harassment, he had made complaints to various authorities through e-mail. He was, however, threatened by the Plant Head, which forced him to make another complaint on 27-10-2017, through e-mail. Upon mediation by the owner of the company, the matter was resolved and he had withdrawn his complaint. He had written to the respondent to grant him promotion, increments, monetary benefits and salary at par with other co-workers of his stature, but the Plant Head had put his remarks that the same be considered in March, 2018, so he sent a reminder, but to no avail. The respondent and its officials had issued false explanations dated 21.04.2018 and 23.04.2018, which were duly replied by him through e-mail. His wife had received a letter dated 27.04.2018, who after reading it got tensed, which led to her miscarriage. He then made a complaint through e-mail on 17.05.2018. Again a frivolous explanation letter was issued to him on 19.05.2018. He responded to it on 21.05.2018. He was wrongly suspended vide letter dated 14.06.2018, without any charge-sheet. False allegations were levelled against him vide charge-sheet dated 04.07.2018. He had replied to the suspension order and the charge-sheet, in detail, but it was not considered by the respondent company. An enquiry was conducted against him but he was not allowed to participate in the same. He was made to sit in the reception room and his mobile phone and documentary record brought by him was tried to be snatched from him by the officials of the company. His services were terminated on the day, on which the reference was sent, so the same is illegal, being during the pendency of the conciliation proceedings. By leveling charges, he was pressurized to withdraw his rightful demand regarding his promotion, increments, work condition etc. He raised an industrial dispute, which led to the present reference. The claim is duly supported with the affidavit of petitioner.

3. Notice of this claim was sent to the respondent and in pursuance thereof the petition was contested by the respondent by filing reply wherein the respondent took preliminary objections regarding lack of maintainability, concealment of material facts, the petitioner is not a workman as he was appointed as a supervisor and that the reference is not a legal one. By asserting an additional plea, the respondent has contended that during the course of his employment, the petitioner had indulged in grave misconduct, hence an independent, fair and impartial enquiry into the misconduct was got conducted by an independent person. The enquiry officer conducted the enquiry as per the principles of the natural justice by affording full opportunity to attend the same, but the petitioner had failed to attend the enquiry proceedings on trifle matters and as such the enquiry officer had proceeded him ex-parte. The petitioner is stated to be gainfully employed and earning more than the amount which he was earning from the respondent. On merits, it is admitted that the petitioner was appointed on the post of Supervisor (Engineering Store) on 02.04.2012 at a monthly salary of Rs. 8,000/-. It was enhanced from time to time and at the time of his dismissal the petitioner was being paid Rs. 19,500/- per month. The duties assigned to him were purely supervisory in nature, hence the provisions of the Act are not attracted in this case. The petitioner had been insisting to be

promoted as Manager/ Assistant Manager (Engineering Store), but the respondent refused as there was no post of Manager Engineering Store. It is denied that the salary of the petitioner was on the lower side. It is admitted that the suspension order and charge-sheet were served upon the petitioner. A Civil Suit for recovery of damages for wrongful termination in the Court of Senior Civil Judge, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. has been filed by the petitioner against the respondent, on the same cause of action. After adopting the legal recourse, his services were rightly dismissed by the respondent. By denying the other allegations, the respondent has prayed for the dismissal of the claim petition.

4. While filing the rejoinder, the petitioner controverted the averments made in the reply and reiterated those in the statement of claim.

5. Out of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for determination and adjudication by this Court, *vide* order dated 30-09-2022:—

1. Whether the termination of the services of the petitioner by the respondent management *w.e.f.* 31-10-2018, without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is illegal and unjustified? If yes, what relief the petitioner is entitled to? ..*OPP.*

2. Whether the service of the petitioner has been terminated by conducting domestic enquiry by the respondent witness in fair and proper manner as alleged? ..*OPP.*

3. Whether the claim petition is neither competent nor maintainable in the present form, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

Relief:

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. Besides having heard the Ld. Counsel for the parties, I have also gone through the record of the case carefully.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues, my findings thereon are as under:

Issue No. 1	: Redundant
Issue No. 2	: Redundant
Issue No. 3	: Yes.
Relief	: Reference is answered in the Negative, as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUE NO. 3

9. Issue no. 3 is taken up first for determination as the main contention of the respondent at the time of filing reply as well as addressing arguments is that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as defined under Section 2-S of the Act.

10. Per the respondent, the petitioner at the time of dismissal was drawing salary of Rs. 19,500/- per month and was primarily performing supervisory duties, as such does not fall within the preview of "workman", as contemplated under Section 2(s) of the Act. As per the respondent the petitioner was appointed initially on 02-04-2012 as supervisor (Engineering Store) at a monthly salary of Rs. 8,000/- and his salary was enhanced from time to time. Thus, per the respondent the present reference is not maintainable as the petitioner does not fall within the definition of the "workman".

11. The petitioner no doubt has admitted that he was engaged in the store department of the respondent company as supervisor, and he was engaged on 20-05-2011. As per the petitioner, he squarely falls within the definition of "workman".

12. Now, coming to the evidence which has been led by the petitioner to prove his case, he has appeared into the witness box as PW-1 and tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the claim petition. The petitioner has also tendered in evidence documents Mark PX-1 to Mark PX-19. During cross-examination, he admitted that the duties assigned to him were supervisory in nature. He also admitted that his last drawn salary was Rs. 19,500/- per month. He stated that he was allowed increment on lesser side and he was not promoted to the post of Manager despite having been promised by the respondent. He admitted that he has filed a civil suit in the Court of Civil Judge Sunder Nagar claiming damages of Rs. 40 lakhs for harassment to him and his family members.

13. The respondent on the other hand examined Shri Sanjay Jain as RW-1 who also tendered in evidence affidavit Ex. RW-1/A which is reproduction of averments as made in the reply. He also tendered in evidence appointment of enquiry officer Ex. R-1, report Ex. R-2, statement and complaints Ex. R-3, statement of witness/chargesheet Mark RX-1, suspension order Mark RX-2, appointment of enquiry officer dated 18.7.2018 Mark RX-3, appointment of MR Mark RX-4, second show cause notice Mark RX-5, dismissal letter Mark RX-6 and reply to conciliation officer Mark RX-7.

14. It, thus, emerges from the facts on record that the petitioner admittedly was appointed in the storage department of the respondent company as Supervisor store. It is also admitted that the last drawn salary of the petitioner was around Rs. 19,500/-. The petitioner has admitted that since he was working as supervisor in the store and was discharging the duties which were supervisory in nature.

15. Before adverting any further, it would be apposite to venture into the legal aspect of the matter, as to whether the petitioner would fall within the terms of Section 2(s) of the Act. The Section read and under:—

> "*Workman" means any person (including an apprentice employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied, and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute, or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person-*
>
> *(i) who is subject to the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), or the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), or the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957); or*
>
> *(ii) who is employed in the police service or as an officer or other employee of a prison; or*

(iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity; or

(iv) who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding one thousand six hundred rupees per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, function mainly of a managerial nature.

16. The definition itself stipulates as to who a workman would be. However, clauses-1 to IV are the exceptions, which have been carved out to say that the following would not fall within the category of a "workman" (in our case clauses- III and IV is relevant to be noticed). The bare reading of the Section shows that a person who is employed in a managerial or administrative capacity would not fall within the term of workman and the person who is employed in a supervisory capacity and draws wages exceeding ` 10,000/- per mensem and discharges functions mainly of a managerial or supervisory in nature would also not come within the purview of the term "workman".

17. Viewed in this context, the admissions made by the petitioner in his cross-examination shows that he had been assigned the duties which were primarily supervisory in nature and that his last drawn salary was Rs. 19,500/-. No doubt, the work or the job profile of the petitioner has not been brought on record by the respondent, but it is by now well settled that the admissions are the best piece of evidence. The admissions made by the petitioner, as discussed aforesaid would go to show that he was employed in the supervisory capacity and had been drawing wages exceeding Rs. 10,000/- mensem and that he had been assigned duties of supervisory nature.

18. Though, in determining the nature of work, the designation of the employee or the name assigned to him should not be given due importance. The primary duty performed by the person is to be given due importance but coming to the case in hand there is no evidence worth the name to suggest that the petitioner was doing any other duties except to supervise the work in the respondent company**. In Somnath Tulshi Ram Galande Vs. Presiding Officer, IInd Labour Court Pune and others 2008 (4) Mh.L.J 163, The Hon'ble Apex Court has held as under:—**

> **"Where a particular workman is a supervisor within or without the definition of "workman" is "ultimately a question of fact, at best one of mixed fact and law" and "will really depend upon the nature of the industry, the type of work in which he is engaged, the organizational set up of the particular unit of industry and the like factors."**

19. The Hon'ble High Court had come to record a finding in the aforesaid case that the appellant therein was undertaking supervisory and managerial work as such he was not covered under the definition of "workman".

20. Similarly, in **S.K. Maini Vs. Carona Sahu Co. Ltd., 1994 AIR 1824,** the Supreme Court has held as under:—

> **"After giving our careful consideration to the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the parties, it appears to us that whether or not an employee is a workman under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act is required to be determined with reference to his principal nature of duties and functions. Such question is required to be determined with reference to the facts and circumstances of the case and materials on record and it is not possible to lay down any straitjacket formula which can decide the dispute as to the real nature of duties and functions being performed by an employee in all cases. When an employee is**

employed to do the types of work enumerated in the definition of workman under Section 2(s), there is hardly any difficulty in treating him as a workman under the appropriate classification but in the complexity of industrial or commercial organizations quite a large number of employees are often required to do more than one kind of work. In such cases, it becomes necessary to determine under which classification the employee will fall for the purpose of deciding whether he comes within the definition of workman or goes out of it ...the designation of an employee is not of much importance and what is important is the nature of duties being performed by the employee. The determinative factor is the main duties of the employee concerned and not some works incidentally done. In other words, what is, in substance, the work which employee does or what in substance he is employed to do. Viewed from this angle, if the employee is mainly doing supervisory work but incidentally or for a fraction of time also does some manual or clerical work, the employee should be held to be doing supervisory works. Conversely, if the main work is of manual, clerical or of technical nature, the mere fact that some supervisory or other work is also done by the employee incidentally or only a small fraction of working time is devoted to some supervisory works, the employee will come within the purview of 'workman' as Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

The appellant in the present case had multifarious duties and most of his duties were supervisory and managerial. He had the power and capacity to take decisions, supervise work of others and was also responsible for quality control of the products being manufactured. The character and nature of his duties while seen in the light of the documentary and oral evidence led by the parties, it can be concluded that the appellant was not a 'workman' within the definition of Section 2(s) of the Act. Looking into the admission of the workman and specific language of Exhibit 29 and the terms and conditions of his appointment, it is difficult to arrive at any conclusion other than the one arrived at by the Labour Court and the learned single Judge in the impugned order."

21. From the statement of claim as available on record, the petitioner has failed to make any averment that he was doing any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational and clerical work. The character and nature of his duties while seen in the light of the evidence as available on record it can be concluded that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as provided under Section 2(s) of the Act. Coming to the case in hand from the statement of claim and evidence as available on record there is no hesitation in the mind of the Court to come to the conclusion that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as provided under Section 2(s) of the Act. Accordingly, issue no.3 is answered in favour of the respondent and against the petitioner.

ISSUES No. 1 & 2

22. Keeping in view my findings on issue no.3 above, both these issues have become redundant and answered accordingly.

RELIEF

23. As a Sequel to my above discussion and findings on issues no. 1 to 3, the claim filed by the petitioner fails and is hereby dismissed being not maintainable. Consequently, the present reference is answered in negative by holding that since the petitioner is not a workman, he is not entitled to any relief from this Court.

24. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication as per law. File be consigned to the record room after necessary compliance by Ahlmad.

Announced in the open Court today on this 8th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla, (H.P.).

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA

Reference Number : 41 of 2025

Instituted on : 29-05-2025

Decided on : 09-12-2025

1. Pankaj Kumar, s/o Sh. Milap Chand, r/o Dagoh Khas, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, H.P.

2. Narender Singh, s/o Sh. Anoop Singh, Village Kathana, P.O. Surla, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P.

3. Jagga Singh, s/o Sh. Karan Singh, r/o Mahtoli, P.O. Diala, Ward No. 3, Dhiala Kangra, H.P.

4. Vijay Rawat, r/o Village Jyundhasli, P.O. Palio, District Gharwal, Uttrakhand.

5. Pawan Kumar, Village Chand Sauli, District Ambala, HR.

6. Ravinder Kumar, s/o Sh. Balwant Ram, V.P.O. Sarawan, Tehsil Bilaspur, District Yamunagar, HR.

7. Bhupender Pal, s/o Sh. Dev Raj, Village Gheru Balh, P.O. Turnoh, District Mandi, H.P. *..Petitioner's.*

VERSUS

The Factory Manager, M/S Rich Products and Solutions Pvt. Ltd., Village Ogli, Nahan Road, Kala-Amb, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. *..Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner's : Nemo

For the Respondent : Sh. Rahul Mahajan, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether the demand raised vide demand notice (copy enclosed) by (i) Sh. Pankaj Kumar, s/o Sh. Milap Chand, r/o Dagoh Khas, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, H.P. (ii) Sh. Narender Singh, s/o Sh. Anoop Singh, Village Kathana, P.O. Surla, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. (iii) Sh. Jagga Singh, s/o Sh. Karan Singh, r/o Mahtoli, P.O. Diala, Ward No. 3, Dhiala Kangra, H.P. (iv) Sh. Vijay Rawat, r/o Village Jyundhasli, P.O. Palio, District Gharwal, Uttrakhand. (V) Sh. Pawan Kumar, Village Chand Sauli, District Ambala, HR. (vi) Sh. Ravinder Kumar, s/o Sh. Balwant Ram, V.P.O. Sarawan, Tehsil Bilaspur, District Yamunagar, HR. (vii) Sh. Bhupender Pal, s/o Sh. Dev Raj, Village Gheru Balh, P.O. Turnoh, District Mandi, H.P. to be fulfilled by Factory Manager M/S Rich Products and Solutions Pvt. Ltd., Village Ogli, Nahan Road, Kala Amb, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. are proper and justified? If yes, to what monetary and other consequential service benefits, the above mentioned workmen are entitled to from the above said Employer?"

2. The case was listed for filing of statement of claim of the parties but, neither the petitioner's nor their counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal, despite the case being called several times since morning. Hence, despite due notice of the date of hearing, the workmen/petitioners had remained *ex-parte*.

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex-parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workmen is present, they are unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue their case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workmen nor their counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex-parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioners to plead and prove on record that the demand raised by (i) Sh. Pankaj Kumar, s/o Sh. Milap Chand, r/o Dagoh Khas, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, H.P. (ii) Sh. Narender Singh, s/o Sh. Anoop Singh, Village Kathana, P.O. Surla, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. (iii) Sh. Jagga Singh, s/o Sh. Karan Singh, r/o Mahtoli, P.O. Diala, Ward No. 3, Dhiala Kangra, H.P. (iv) Sh. Vijay Rawat, R/o Village Jyundhasli, P.O. Palio, District Gharwal, Uttrakhand. (V) Sh. Pawan Kumar, Village Chand Sauli, District Ambala, HR. (vi) Sh. Ravinder Kumar, s/o Sh. Balwant Ram, VPO Sarawan, Tehsil Bilaspur, District Yamunagar, HR. (vii) Sh. Bhupender Pal, s/o Sh. Dev Raj, Village Gheru Balh, P.O. Turnoh, District Mandi, H.P. to be fulfilled by Factory Manager M/S Rich Products and Solutions Pvt. Ltd., Village Ogli, Nahan Road, Kala Amb, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. are unjustified, however, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioners/ workmen. Since, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioners that they are entitled to any benefits and relief as claimed in demand from the respondent management, it cannot be held that the demand raised by the petitioners are genuine and justified. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioners/workmen have not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the petitioners are not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 9th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla, (H.P.).

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 143 of 2025

Instituted on : 18-08-2025

Decided on : 12-12-2025

Rajeshwari, w/o Sh. Soran, c/o Satish Kumar, President Distt. Solan, H.P. A.I.T.U.C., H.Q. #7, Omaxe Parkwoods Phase-II, Chakkan Road, Baddi, District Solan, H.P. ..*Petitioner*.

VERSUS

1. The Managing Director, M/S Charak Pharma Pvt. Ltd., Khasra No. 186/1, 139/3, Village Katha, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. 173205.

2. M/S KDR Associates (Contractor) c/o M/S Charak Pharma Pvt. Ltd. Khasra No. 186/1, 139/3, Village Katha, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. 173205. ..*Respondents*.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondent no. 1 : Sh. Prateek Kumar, Adv.

For the Respondent no. 2 : Nemo

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

> *"Whether the termination of the services of Smt. Rajeshwari w/o Sh. Soran, C/O Satish Kumar, President Distt. Solan, H.P. A.I.T.U.C., H.Q. #7, Omaxe Parkwoods Phase-II, Chakkan Road, Baddi, District Solan, H.P. by (i) the Managing Director, M/S Charak Pharma Pvt. Ltd., Khasra No. 186/1, 139/3, Village Katha, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. 173205 (Principal Employer) (ii) M/S KDR Associates (Contractor) C/O M/S Charak Pharma Pvt. Ltd., Khasra No. 186/1, 139/3, Village Katha, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. 173205 w.e.f. 01.03.2024, without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as alleged, by the workman, is legal and justified? If not, what relief of reinstatement, seniority, amount of back wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above managements?"*

2. The case was listed for appearance of the parties for today but, however, neither the petitioner as well as respondent no. 2 nor their counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal, despite the case being called several times since morning. Hence, despite due notice of the date of hearing, the workman/ petitioner had remained *ex-parte*.

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, she is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue her case.

8. In the instant case, neither the parties nor any counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex-parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that the termination of her services w.e.f. 01.03.2024 was without complying with the provisions of the Act and, thus, illegal and unjustified. However, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman had not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the

matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 12th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla,(H.P.)

Ref. 83/19

Sanjay Thakur v/s MMU Solan

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13-12-2025

13.12.2025

Present Sh. Deepak Kumar, Advocate Vice Csl. for the petitioner.

None for respondent.

With the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e* the reference received from the appropriate Government under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 vide notification no. 11- 2/93 (Lab)ID/2019/Solan-Sanjay, dated 30.04.2019 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 83 of 2019 titled as Sanjay Thakur Vs. MMU Solan, stood amicably resolved between the parties during pre lokAdalat held on 29.11.2025. The petitioner has stated that the respondent has agreed to re-engage him with seniority and continuity. The respondent has also agreed to pay back-wages *w.e.f.* 12.06.2018 to 15.12.2025 @ 25% of last drawn wages on or before 15.01.2026. Now nothing survive in the present reference. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Ajay Singal, Registrar of respondent college has admitted the aforesaid statement of petitioner to be correct and now nothing survive in the present reference petition. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National LokAdalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement, therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement(s) of both the parties shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after comp be consigned to record room.

Announced: 13-12-2025

(Veena Kashyap) .	(Shailee Thakur)	(Anuja Sood)
Member	Member	Chairman, National Lok Adalat.

App. 54/2019

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13-12-2025

13.12.2025

Present Sh. Deepak, Advocate vice Csl. for petitioner
None for the respondent

With the due divulgence of National LokAdalat and with the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e* the claim petition filed under Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 registered as Application No. 54 of 2019 titled as Deepan Vs. Registrar, Maharishi Markandeshwar Medical College, Solan, stood amicably resolved between the parties during pre lok Adalat held on 08.12.2025. The Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has stated that he has compromised the dispute with the respondent University as the respondent has agreed to pay an amount of Rs. 3,50,000/- (Rs. Three lakhs Fifty only) to him on or before 15.01.2026. Now, there is no dispute with the respondent arising out of this application and the application be decided accordingly. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Ajay Singhal, Registrar of respondent University has admitted the aforesaid statement of Ld. Counsel for the petitioner to be correct and agreed to pay the settled amount on or before 15.01.2026 failing which the petitioner shall be entitled for interest @ 12% per annum. Now, nothing survive in the present application.

Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National Lok Adalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement, therefore, nothing survive in this claim/application. The respondent is directed to pay the agreed settlement amount of Rs. 3,50,000/- to the petitioner on or before 15.01.2026 failing which the petitioner is held entitled for interest @ 12% per annum from the date of order.The statement(s) of learned counsel for the respondent as well as petitioner shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for Publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced: 13.12.2025

(Veena Kashyap) . (Shailee Thakur) (Anuja Sood)
Member Member Chairman, National Lok Adalat.

Ref.151/2025

Dhyan Singh V/s MMU, Solan.

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13-12-2025

13.12.2025

Present None

With the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e.* the reference received from the appropriate Government under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 vide notification no. 11- 2/93 (Lab)ID/2025/Solan, dated 30.08.2025 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 151 of 2025 titled as Dhyan Singh Vs. The Registrar MMU Solan, stood amicably

resolved between the parties during pre lokAdalat held on 11.12.2025. The AR for the petitioner has stated that the petitioner has compromised the dispute with the respondent as the respondent has paid an amount of Rs. 90,000/- (Rs. Ninty Thousand only) as full and final amount of claim arising out of reference no. 151 of 2025 and now the petitioner has no claim against the respondent and nothing survive in the present reference petition. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statement, this National LokAdalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the petitioner has settled the dispute amicably. Since, the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement, therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement of petitioner shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced:13-12-2025

(Veena Kashyap) .
Member

(Shailee Thakur)
Member

(Anuja Sood)
Chairman, National Lok Adalat.

Ref.147/2024

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13-12-2025

Manoj Sharma Vs. M/s JHS Ltd.

13-12-2025

Present Petitioner in person

Sh. Amrish Kumar, Senior Executive of respondent

With the due divulgence of National LokAdalat 11- and with the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e.* the reference received from the appropriate Government under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 vide notification no. 11-1/86(Lab)ID/2024/Nahan, dated 04.11.2024 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 147 of 2024 titled as Manoj Sharma Vs. Occupier/Factory Manager M/s JHS Ltd., stood amicably resolved between the parties. The petitioner has stated that he has compromised the dispute with the respondent company and has received an amount of Rs. 90,000/- through Cheque No. 632 from the respondent company as full and final amount of his claim arising out of reference no. 147 of 2024 and now he has no claim against the respondent company and nothing survive in the present reference petition. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Amrish Kumar, Senior Executive of respondent company has admitted the aforesaid statement of petitioner to be correct on behalf of respondent company.

Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National LokAdalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since, the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement, therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement(s) both the parties shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced:13-12-2025

(Veena Kashyap)	(Shailee Thakur)	(Anuja Sood)
Member	Member	Chairman, National Lok Adalat

Ref. 75/2020

Sh. Deepak Kaushal VIS M/s Microtek Himachal Power Products.

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13-12-2025

13-12-2025

Present None for the petitioner

Sh. Sandeep Sharma, Manager (Legal) for the respondent

With the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e.* the reference received from the appropriate Government under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 vide notification no. 11- 2/93(Lab)ID/2020/Solan-Deepak, dated 02.06.2020 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 75 of 2020 titled as Deepak Kaushal Vs. M/s Microtek Himachal Power Products, stood amicably resolved between the parties during pre lok Adalat held on 06.11.2025. The petitioner has stated that he has compromised the dispute with the respondent company and has received an amount of Rs. 36,000/- through Cheque No. 1690 from the respondent company as full and final amount of his claim arising out of reference no. 75 of 2020 and now he has no claim against the respondent company and nothing survive in the present reference petition. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Sandeep Sharma, Manager (Legal) of respondent company has admitted the aforesaid statement of petitioner to be correct on behalf of respondent company.

Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National Lok Adalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since, the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement(s) both the parties shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced:13.12.2025.

(Veena Kashyap) .	(Shailee Thakur)	(Anuja Sood)
Member	Member	Chairman, National Lok Adalat.

Ref. 152/2024

Sh. Bhim Yadav V/S M/s Microtek Universal Power Products.

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13-12-2025

13-12-2025

Present Petitioner with Ms. Heena Chauhan, Ld. Csl. for the petitioner

Sh. Sandeep Sharma, Manager (Legal) for the respondent

With the due divulgence of National LokAdalat and with the intervention of this Court, the matter i.e the reference received from the appropriate Government under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 vide 2/93 (Lab)ID/2024/Solan, dated 02.12.2024 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 152 of 2024 titled as BhimYadav Vs. The Factory Manager, M/s Microtek Universal Power Products, stood amicably resolved between the parties during pre lokAdalat held on 10.12.2025. The petitioner has stated that he has compromised the dispute with the respondent company as the respondent company has agreed to pay an amount of Rs. 2,60,000/- (Rs. Two Lakhs Sixty Thousand only) within a period of ten days as full and final amount of his claim arising out of reference no. 152 of 2024 and now he has no claim against the respondent company and nothing survive in the present reference petition. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Sandeep Sharma, Head Legal of respondent company has admitted the aforesaid statement of petitioner to be correct on behalf of respondent company.

Today, also the petitioner vide his separate statement has further stated that he has received an amount of Rs. 2,60,00. through cheque no. 000018 from the respondent today before National LokAdalat.

Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National LokAdalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement, therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement(s) of both the parties shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced:13-12-2025

(Veena Kashyap) (Shailee Thakur) (Anuja Sood)
Member Member Chairman, National Lok Adalat

Ref. 24/2023

Sh. Naresh Bharti V/s M/s Delhivery Ltd.

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13-12-2025

13-12-2025

Present None

With the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e.* the referecne received from the appropriate Governemnt under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 vide notification

no. 11- 6/85(Lab)ID/2022/Shimla-Naresh, dated 29.11.2022 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 24 of 2023 titled as Naresh Bharti Vs. M/s Delhivery Ltd., stood amicably resolved between the parties during pre lokAdalat held on 26.11.2025. The petitioner has stated that he has compromised the dispute with the respondent company and has received an amount of Rs. 40,000/- through demand draft No. 444529 from the respondent company as full and final amount of his claim arising out of reference no. 24 of 2023 and now he has no claim against the respondent company and nothing survive in the present reference petition. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Kulvir Thakur, Advocate for respondent company has admitted the aforesaid statement of petitioner to be correct on behalf of respondent company.

Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National Lok Adalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement(s) of learned counsel for the respondent as well as petitioner shall form part a parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced:13.12.2025

(Veena Kashyap)	(Shailee Thakur)	(Anuja Sood)
Member	Member	Chairman, National Lok Adalat

23-12-2025

Present Sh. Anil Thakur, Ld. Csl. for the petitioner.

(PoA has been filed. It be taken on record)

Notice issued to the respondent, but none has appeared on behalf of him.

However, at this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner has made a statement without oath that the petitioner has compromise the matter with the respondent outside of the Court and he is not interested to proceeded further with this matter. Since, parties have effected the compromise out side the Court and petitioner is neither interested to proceeded further this reference and the same is disposed off. The reference received from the appropriate government is answered accordingly. The statement of the learned counsel for the petitioner shall form part and parcel of this award. Let a copy of this award be communicated to the appropriate government for its publication in the official gazette. File, after competing be consigned to records.

Announced:23-12-2025

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court, Shimla,
Camp Court at Nahan.

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 59 of 2024

Instituted on : 24-07-2024

Decided on : 30-12-2025

Rajmal Thakur, s/o Sh. Birbal Ram Thakur, c/o J.C. Bhardwaj, President HP AITUC, HQ: Saproon District Solan, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The Managing Director, M/s Exicom Tele-Systems Ltd., 8 Electronics Complex Chambaghat, Tehsil & District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner : Nemo.

For the Respondent : Ms. Vandana, Advocate.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

1. "Whether Sh. Rajmal Thakur, s/o Sh. Birbal Ram Thakur, R/O Village Hiun. P.O. Nalyana, Tehsil Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P., who was initially engaged as Senior Technician Assistant and subsequently by virtue of seniority/ promotion working as Engineer at the time of termination of services, falls under the definition of 'workman' u/s 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947? If yes, what relief, Sh. Rajmal Thakur is entitled to? And if not, what it's legal effect?"

2. Whether the demand of Sh. Rajmal Thakur, s/o Sh. Birbal Ram Thakur, R/O Village Hiun, P.O. Nalyana, Tehsil Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P., for his reinstatement in service before the Managing Director, M/s Exicom Tele-Systems Ltd. 8 Electronics Complex Chambaghat, Tehsil & District Solan, H.P., is proper and justified? If yes, what relief the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management?" and If not, its effect?"

2. The case was listed for appearance of the parties for today but, however, neither the petitioner nor his counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal, despite the case being called several times since morning. Hence, despite due notice of the date of hearing, the workman/petitioner had remained *ex-parte.*

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex-parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor his counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex-parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that he falls under the definition of the workman under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act and further that he is entitled for reinstatement in service. However, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman had not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 30th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla, (H.P.)

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA

Reference Number : 198 of 2021

Instituted on : 27-10-2021

Decided on : 31-12-2025

Janav Kumar, s/o Sh. Kali Dass, r/o Village Khanewali, P.O. Dev Nagar, Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The Factory Manager, M/S Sweet Industries India Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 17, Sector-1 Parwanoo, Tehsil Kasauli, District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner : Nemo.

For the Respondent : Sh. Prateek Kumar, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

> *"Whether non-payment of full and final (which includes bonus, leave encashment and gratuity) to the workman Sh. Janav Kumar, s/o Sh. Kali Dass, R/o Village Khanewali, P.O. Dev Nagar, Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla, H.P. by the Management of M/S Sweet Industries India Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 17, Sector-1 Parwanoo, Tehsil Kasauli, District Solan, H.P. on account of his resignation after serving one month notice to the management, is legal and justified? If not, what benefits the above workman is entitled to?"*

2. The case was listed for the evidence of the petitioner for today, the petitioner has still not turned up, neither anyone else has appeared on his behalf, nor any witness is present nor any steps have been taken. This was the last opportunity granted to the petitioner for evidence but despite that neither the petitioner nor any evidence is present today in the Court. As such, workman/petitioner has remained *ex-parte.*

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.—If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex-parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to lead any evidence in support of statement of claim and to argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor his counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that non-payment of full and final (which includes bonus, leave encashment and gratuity) to the petitioner by the management of respondent on account of his resignation after serving one month notice to the management, is legal and justified. However, there is no evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition, it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman has not put in appearance before this Tribunal as such the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 31st day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Tribunal, Shimla, (H.P.).

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 11th March, 2026

No. HHC/Admn.E.5(13)2023-CAO.—Smt. Meenakshi Thakur, Chief Administrative Officer, of the office of District and Sessions Judge, Mandi, H.P., shall stand retired from service on and with effect from 30-04-2026 (AN) on attaining the age of superannuation, as per the provision of Rule 74 of CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972.

By order,

Sd/-
Registrar General.

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 12th March, 2026

No. HHC/Admn.16 (10)74-VII.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice, in exercise of the powers vested in him u/s 139(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, Section 333(1)(b) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and Rule 5(vi) of the H.P. Oath Commissioners (Appointment & Control) Rules, 2007, has been pleased to appoint Ms. Minakshi Thakur (HIM/353/2016), Advocate, as Oath Commissioner at **Kullu**, H.P., for a period of two years with immediate effect, for administering oaths and affirmations on affidavits to the deponents under the aforesaid Codes and Rules.

By order of Hon'ble the Chief Justice,

Sd/-
Registrar (Administration).

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 12th March, 2026

No. HHC/Admn.16(10)74-VII.— Hon'ble the Chief Justice, in exercise of the powers vested in him u/s 139(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, Section 333(1)(b) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and Rule 5 (vi) of the H.P. Oath Commissioners (Appointment & Control) Rules, 2007, has been pleased to appoint Kumari Anchala Devi (HIM/590/2023), Advocates, as Oath Commissionersat at **Manali**, District Kullu, H.P. for a period of two years with immediate effect for administering oaths and affirmations on affidavits to the deponents under the aforesaid Codes and Rules.

By order of Hon'ble the Chief Justice,

Sd/-
Registrar (Administration).

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 12th March, 2026

No. HHC/Admn.16(10)74-VII.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice, in exercise of the powers vested in him u/s 139(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, Section 333(1)(b) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and Rule 5(vi) of the H.P. Oath Commissioners (Appointment & Control) Rules, 2007 has been pleased to appoint Sh. Sachinder Pal Singh (HIM/324/2018), Advocate, as Oath Commissioners at **Keylong**, for a period of two years *w.e.f.* **10-03-2026**, for administering oaths and affirmations on affidavits to the deponents under the aforesaid Codes and Rules.

By order of Hon'ble the Chief Justice,

Sd/-
Registrar (Administration).

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 13th March, 2026

No. HHC/Admn.16(13)74-XII.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice, in exercise of the powers vested in him u/s 139(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, Section 333(1)(b) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and Rule 5 (vi) of the H.P. Oath Commissioners (Appointment & Control) Rules, 2007, has been pleased to appoint Ms. Saroj Thakur (HIM/58/2023) and

Ms. DikshaVerma (HIM/48/2001), Advocates, as Oath Commissioners, at District Courts, Chakkar, Shimla, for a period of two years with immediate effect for administering oaths and affirmations on affidavits to the deponents under the aforesaid Codes and Rules.

By order of Hon'ble the Chief Justice,
Sd/-
Registrar (Administration).

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 16th March, 2026

No. HHC/Admn.10 (151)/94-XIII.—In compliance to the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India *vide* judgement dated 15-12-2022, in the matter of Civil Appeal No. 9322 of 2022, titled as "Gohar Mohammad Versus Uttar Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation & Ors., Division-wise Police Stations of the State were attached with Motor Accident Claims Tribunals, vide notification No. HHC/Admn.10 (151)/94-IX-Part-18604-19, dated 03-04-07.2023."

Now, in partial modification of aforesaid notification, the district wise Police Stations of the Civil and Sessions Division, Kullu are redistributed/ re-attached as under: —

Name of the Division	Name of the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal(s)	Police Station
Kullu	**Motor Accident Claims Tribunal-I, Kullu** (D&SJ, Kullu). Phone. No. 01902-224378, FAX No. 225514 Email ID:- mact1-kul@hp.gov.in	1. Kullu 2. Bhunter 3. Banjar 4. Manikaran 5. Keylong (District Lahaul-Spiti)
	Motor Accident Claims Tribunal-II, Kullu (AD&SJ, Kullu-I). Phone. No. 01902-226747, Email ID:- mact2-kul@hp.gov.in	1. Manali 2. Paltikuhal 3. Sainj 4.Traffic-cum-Tourist Police Station, Bhunter 5. Udaipur (District Lahaul-Spiti) 6. Sissu(District Lahaul-Spiti)

By order,

Sd/-
Registrar General,
High Court of Himachal Pradesh.

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 18th March, 2026

No. HHC/Admn. 6(23)/74-XVII.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him under Rule 2 (32) of Chapter 1 of H.P. Financial Rules, 2009 has been pleased to declare the Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC, Chamba Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the Court of Senior Civil Judge-*cum*-CJM, Chambaand also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of salary, T.A. etc. in respect of the Class II to IV establishments attached to the aforesaid Court under Major head "2014 Administration of Justice" during the earned leave period of Sh. Nikhil Agarwal, Senior Civil Judge-*cum*-CJM, Chambaw.e.f. 23-03-2026 to 28-03-2026 with permission to prefix Gazetted holiday and Sunday falling on 21-03-2026 and 22-03-2026 and to suffix Sunday falling on 29-03-2026 or till he returns from leave.

By order,
Sd/-
Registrar General.

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 18th March, 2026

No. HHC/Admn.6 (23)/74-XVII.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him under Rule 2 (32) of Chapter 1 of H.P. Financial Rules, 2009 has been pleased to declare Additional District and Sessions Judge-I, Nurpur as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the Court of Additional District and Sessions Judge-II, Nurpur and also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of salary, T.A. etc. in respect of Class II to IV establishments attached to the aforesaid Court under Major head “2014 Administration of Justice” during the earned leave period of Sh. Nitin Mittal, Additional District and Sessions Judge-II, Nurpur *w.e.f.* 16-03-2026 to 20-03-2026 with permission to prefix Sunday falling on 15-03-2026 and suffix Gazetted holiday and Sunday falling on 21-03-2026 and 22-03-2026 or till he returns from leave.

By order,

Sd/-
Registrar General.

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 18th March, 2026

No. HHC/GAZ/14-301/08-I.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice has been pleased to grant 05 days earned leave *w.e.f.* 16-03-2026 to 20-03-2026 with permission to prefix 15-03-2026 being Sunday

and suffix 21-03-2026 and 22-03-2026 being Gazetted holiday and Sunday, respectively in favour of Sh. Nitin Mittal, Additional District and Sessions Judge-II, Nurpur.

Certified that Sh. Nitin Mittal is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Sh. Nitin Mittal, would have continued to hold the post of Additional District and Sessions Judge-II, Nurpur but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

.

By order,

Sd/-
Registrar General.

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 18th March, 2026

No. HHC/GAZ/14-324/2011.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice has been pleased to grant *ex-post facto* sanction of 02 days' earned leave for 30-11-2025 and 01-12-2025 in favour of Sh. Vishal Bhamnotra, Senior Civil Judge-*cum*-CJM, Kinnaur at Reckong Peo.

Certified that Sh. Vishal Bhamnotra has joined the same post and at the same station from where he proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Sh. Vishal Bhamnotra would continue to hold the post of Senior Civil Judge-*cum*-CJM, Kinnaur at Reckong Peo, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

By order,

Sd/-
Registrar General.

हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा सचिवालय

अधिसूचना

दिनांक 30 मार्च, 2026

संख्याः वि0स0–विधायन–विधेयक / 1–11 / 2026.—हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा की प्रक्रिया एवं कार्य संचालन नियमावली, 1973 के नियम–140 के अन्तर्गत **भारतीय स्टाम्प (हिमाचल प्रदेश संशोधन) विधेयक, 2026 (2026 का विधेयक संख्यांक 4)** जो आज दिनांक 30 मार्च, 2026 को हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा में पुरःस्थापित हो चुका है, सर्व–साधारण को सूचनार्थ राजपत्र में मुद्रित करने हेतु प्रेषित किया जाता है।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
(यशपाल)
सचिव,
हि0प्र0 विधान सभा।

2026 का विधयेक संख्यांक 4.

भारतीय स्टाम्प (हिमाचल प्रदेश संशोधन) विधयेक, 2026

खण्डों का क्रम

खण्डः

1. संक्षिप्त नाम।
2. धारा 47–अ का संशोधन।
3. अनुसूची I–क का संशोधन।

———————

2026 का विधयेक संख्यांक 4.

भारतीय स्टाम्प (हिमाचल प्रदेश संशोधन) विधेयक, 2026

(विधान सभा में पुरःस्थापित रूप में)

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य को यथा लागू भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 2) का और संशोधन करने के लिए **विधेयक।**

भारत गणराज्य के सत्तहतरवें वर्ष में हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा द्वारा निम्नलिखित रूप में यह अधिनियम होः–

1. **संक्षिप्त नाम.**––इस अधिनियम का संक्षिप्त नाम भारतीय स्टाम्प (हिमाचल प्रदेश संशोधन) अधिनियम, 2026 है।

2. **धारा 47–अ का संशोधन.**––हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य को यथा लागू भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् "मूल अधिनियम" कहा गया है), की धारा 47–अ की उप–धारा (3) में "तीन वर्ष" शब्दों के स्थान पर "दस वर्ष" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।

3. **अनूसूची I –क का संशोधन.**––मूल अधिनियम की अनुसूची I–क के अनुच्छेद 31 के खण्ड(ख) के सामने स्तम्भ संख्या 3 के अंत में चिन्ह "।" के स्थान पर ":" चिन्ह रखा जाएगा और तत्पश्चात् निम्नलिखित परंतुक अंतःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:–

> "परन्तु रक्त संबंध से अन्यथा पुरूष और महिला के मध्य असमान बाजार मूल्य की संपत्तियों के विनिमय की दशा में, असमान मूल्य के अंतर की राशि पर, उस व्यक्ति, जिसके पक्ष में उच्चत्तर मूल्य की संपत्ति हस्तांतरित की गई है, को अनुच्छेद 23 (हस्तांतरण) के अनुसार लागू दर पर स्टाम्प शुल्क देय होगा।''।

————————

उद्देश्यों और कारणों का कथन

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य में यथा लागू भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 की धारा 47–अ की उपधारा (3), किसी भी दस्तावेज में स्टाम्प शुल्क के न्यून–मूल्यांकन के मामलों में कार्यवाही प्रारम्भ करने के लिए रजिस्ट्रीकरण की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की परिसीमा प्रदान करती है।

यह देखा गया है कि स्टाम्प शुल्क के न्यून–मूल्यांकन से संबंधित महत्वपूर्ण तथ्य प्रायः तीन वर्ष की उक्त अवधि समाप्त होने के पश्चात् ही अधिकारियों के संज्ञान में आते हैं, जिसके परिणामस्वरूप राज्य सरकार स्टाम्प शुल्क की कमी की राशि की वसूली करने में असमर्थ रहती है और राज्य कोष को हानि होती है। इस विवाद्यक के समाधान हेतु धारा 47–अ की उपधारा (3) में प्रदत्त तीन वर्ष की परिसीमा अवधि को बढ़ाकर दस वर्ष तक करने का प्रस्ताव है।

इसके अतिरिक्त, वर्तमान में हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य में यथा लागू भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 की अनुसूची I–क, अनुच्छेद 23 (हस्तांतरण) के अधीन महिलाओं के लिए अस्सी लाख तक के लेन–देन पर रियायती दर से स्टाम्प शुल्क प्रदान करती है। तथापि, अनुच्छेद 31(ख) के अंतर्गत पुरुष और महिला व्यक्तियों (जो रक्त संबंधी नहीं हैं) के बीच संपत्तियों के विनिमय के मामले में स्टाम्प शुल्क की लागू दर को लेकर भ्रम की स्थिति है। इस अस्पष्टता को दूर करने हेतु अनुच्छेद 31(ख) में एक उपबंध जोड़ने का प्रस्ताव है, जिससे स्टाम्प शुल्क की लागू दर स्पष्ट हो सके।

यह विधेयक उपर्युक्त उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति के लिए है।

(जगत सिंह नेगी)
प्रभारी मन्त्री।

शिमलाः

तारीख.....2026

AUTHORITATIVE ENGLISH TEXT

Bill No. 4 of 2026.

THE INDIAN STAMP (HIMACHAL PRADESH AMENDMENT) BILL, 2026

ARRANGEMENT OF CLAUSES

Clauses:

1. Short title.
2. Amendment of section 47-A.
3. Amendment in SCHEDULE I-A.

Bill No. 4 of 2026.

THE INDIAN STAMP (HIMACHAL PRADESH AMENDMENT) BILL, 2026

(AS INTRODUCED IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY)

A

BILL

further to amend the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (Act No. 2 of 1899) in its application to the State of Himachal Pradesh.

BE it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of Himachal Pradesh in the Seventy-seventh Year of the Republic of India as follows:—

1. Short title.—This Act may be called the Indian Stamp (Himachal Pradesh Amendment) Act, 2026.

2. Amendment of section 47-A.—In section 47-A of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (hereinafter referred to as the "Principal Act"), in sub-section (3), for the words "three years", the words " ten years" shall be substituted.

3. Amendment of SCHEDULE I-A.—In SCHEDULE I-A of the principal Act, in article 31, in clause (b), against column No. 3, at the end, for the sign "." the sign ":" shall be substituted and thereafter the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:—

> "Provided that in case of an exchange of properties between a male and a female not related by blood, the stamp duty on the differential amount of the exchanged properties having unequal market value, shall be levied as per article 23 (Conveyance), and at the rate applicable to the person in whose favour the property of higher value is transferred.".

STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS

The sub-section (3) of section 47-A of Indian Stamp Act 1899, as applicable to the State of Himachal Pradesh provides a limitation of three years from date of registration of any instrument to initiate proceedings in cases of undervaluation of stamp duty.

It has been observed that material facts regarding under valuation of Stamp duty often come to the notice of authorities after the expiry of said period of three years, resulting in State Government's inability to recover deficient amount of Stamp Duty and consequent loss to State exchequer. To address the issue the three years limitation period provided under sub-section (3) of Section 47-A is proposed to be enhanced to ten years.

Further, at present the Schedule I-A of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899, as applicable to the State of Himachal Pradesh provides concessional rate of Stamp Duty for female under article 23 (Conveyance) for transaction up to eighty lakh. However, in case of exchange of properties between male and female persons not related by blood under article 31(b) of Schedule I-A, there is

confusion regarding the applicable rate of Stamp Duty. In order to remove the ambiguity a proviso is proposed in article 31(b) to clarify applicable rate of Stamp Duty.

This Bill seeks to achieve the aforesaid objectives.

(JAGAT SINGH NEGI)
Minister-in-Charge.

SHIMLA:

The , 2026.

हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा सचिवालय

अधिसूचना

दिनांक 30 मार्च, 2026

संख्याः वि0स0–विधायन बजट / 1–8 / 2026.––हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा की प्रक्रिया एवं कार्य संचालन नियमावली, 1973 के नियम / 140 के अन्तर्गत हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग (संख्यांक 2) विधेयक, 2026 (2026 का विधेयक संख्यांक) जो आज दिनांक 30 मार्च, 2026 को हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा में पुरःस्थापित हो चुका है, सर्व–साधारण को सूचनार्थ राजपत्र (ई–गजट), में अधिसूचित करने हेतु प्रेषित किया जाता है।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
(यशपाल),
सचिव,
हि0 प्र0 विधान सभा।

2026 का विधेयक संख्यांक 3

हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग (संख्यांक 2) विधेयक, 2026

खण्डों का क्रम

खण्डः

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ।

2. हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से वित्तीय वर्ष 2026–27 के लिए ₹ 5,88,30,66,70,000 की राशि जारी करना।

3. विनियोग।

4. निरसन और व्यावृत्तियां।

अनुसूची

2026 का विधेयक संख्यांक 3.

हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग (संख्यांक 2) विधेयक, 2026

(विधान सभा में पुरःस्थापित रूप में)

वित्तीय वर्ष 2026–27 के लिए हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से सेवाओं के लिए कतिपय धनराशियों के संदाय को प्राधिकृत करने और उनका विनियोग करने के लिए **विधेयक**।

भारत गणराज्य के सत्तहतरवें वर्ष में हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा द्वारा निम्नलिखित रूप में यह अधिनियमित हो :–

1. **संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.**––(1) इस अधिनियम का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग (संख्यांक 2) अधिनियम, 2026 है।

(2) यह प्रथम अप्रैल, 2026 को लागू होगा।

2. **हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से वित्तीय वर्ष 2026–27 के लिए ₹ 5,88,30,66,70,000 की राशि जारी करना.**––हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से **अनुसूची** के तृतीय स्तम्भ में विनिर्दिष्ट से अनधिक धनराशियां जिनका योग केवल **₹** 5,88,30,66,70,000 (अठावन हज़ार आठ सौ तीस करोड़ छियासठ लाख सत्तर हज़ार रुपए) है, संदत्त और उपयोजित की जाएं, जिनका वित्तीय वर्ष 2026–27 की अवधि में **अनुसूची** के द्वितीय स्तम्भ में विनिर्दिष्ट सेवाओं और प्रयोजनों से सम्बन्धित विभिन्न प्रभारों के संदाय को चुकाने के लिए उपयोग किया जाएगा।

3. **विनियोग.**––इस अधिनियम द्वारा हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से संदत्त और उपयोजित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत धनराशियों का उक्त वर्ष के सम्बन्ध में अनुसूची में अभिव्यक्त सेवाओं और प्रयोजनों के लिए विनियोग किया जाएगा।

4. **निरसन और व्यावृत्तियां.**––निम्नलिखित विनिर्दिष्ट विनियोग अधिनियमों का एतद्द्वारा निरसन किया जाता है, अर्थात्:–

(i) हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग अधिनियम, 2025 (2025 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 31); और

(ii) हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग (संख्यांक 2) अधिनियम, 2025 (2025 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 32):

परन्तु ऐसा निरसन निम्नलिखित को प्रभावित नहीं करेगा:–

(क) किसी अन्य ऐसी अधिनियमितियों को प्रभावित नहीं करेगा जिसमें निरसित अधिनियमिति को लागू, सम्मिलित या निर्दिष्ट किया गया है; या

(ख) पहले की गई या हुई किसी बात या पहले से अर्जित या उपगत किसी अधिकार, हक, बाध्यता या दायित्व अथवा उसके विषय में किसी उपचार या कार्यवाही या किसी ऋण, शास्ति, बाध्यता, दायित्व, दावे या मांग से कोई निर्मोचन या उन्मोचन या पहले ही अनुदत्त किसी क्षतिपूर्ति या किसी पूर्व कार्य या बात के सबूत की विधिमान्यता, अविधिमान्यता, उसके प्रभाव या परिणामों पर प्रभाव नहीं डालेगा; या

(ग) विधि के किसी सिद्धान्त या नियम या स्थापित अधिकारिता, अभिवचन के प्ररूप या अनुक्रम, पद्धति या प्रक्रिया या विद्यमान विशेषाधिकार, निर्बन्धन, छूट, पद या नियुक्ति पर नहीं पड़ेगा चाहे वह, इसके द्वारा निरसित किसी अधिनियमिति द्वारा उसमें या उससे किसी रीति से पुष्ट, मान्य या व्युतपन्न क्यों न हो; या

(घ) संपरीक्षा, परीक्षण, लेखा, अन्वेषण, जांच या उससे सम्बन्धित किसी प्राधिकारी द्वारा की गई या की जाने वाली किसी अन्य कार्रवाई पर नहीं पड़ेगा और ऐसी संपरीक्षा, परीक्षण, लेखा, अन्वेषण, जांच या कार्रवाई की जा सकती है, और, या जारी रखी जा सकती है, मानो उक्त अधिनियमितियां इस अधिनियम द्वारा निरसित ही न की गई हों।

अनुसूची

(धारा 2 और 3 देखें)

1	2		3		
मांग संख्या	सेवाएं और प्रयोजन		निम्नलिखित राशियों से अनधिक		
			विधान सभा द्वारा दत्तमत	संचित निधि पर प्रभारित	कुल
			₹ में	₹ में	₹ में
01	विधान सभा	(राजस्व)	52,84,93,000	1,71,17,000	54,56,10,000
		(पूंजीगत)	3,15,00,000	—	3,15,00,000
02	राज्यपाल और मन्त्री परिषद्	(राजस्व)	18,48,13,000	9,03,61,000	27,51,74,000
03	न्याय प्रशासन	(राजस्व)	2,64,81,88,000	68,55,88,000	3,33,37,76,000
		(पूंजीगत)	4,04,00,000	—	4,04,00,000
04	सामान्य प्रशासन	(राजस्व)	1,99,26,16,000	14,32,33,000	2,13,58,49,000
05	भू–राजस्व व जिला प्रशासन	(राजस्व)	16,15,35,13,000	—	16,15,35,13,000
06	आबकारी और कराधान	(राजस्व)	1,23,53,75,000	—	1,23,53,75,000
07	पुलिस और सम्बद्ध संगठन	(राजस्व)	17,48,38,69,000	—	17,48,38,69,000
		(पूंजीगत)	3,38,00,000	—	3,38,00,000
08	शिक्षा	(राजस्व)	88,48,86,03,000	—	88,48,86,03,000
09	स्वास्थ्य एवं परिवार कल्याण	(राजस्व)	27,04,54,01,000	—	27,04,54,01,000
		(पूंजीगत)	35,19,14,000	—	35,19,14,000
10	लोक निर्माण– सड़क, पुल एवं भवन	(राजस्व)	24,81,76,28,000	—	24,81,76,28,000
		(पूंजीगत)	11,04,82,00,000	—	11,04,82,00,000
11	कृषि	(राजस्व)	3,38,85,53,000	—	3,38,85,53,000
		(पूंजीगत)	16,05,37,000	—	16,05,37,000
12	उद्यान	(राजस्व)	3,02,93,55,000	—	3,02,93,55,000
		(पूंजीगत)	5,93,12,000	—	5,93,12,000
13	सिंचाई, जलापूर्ति एवं सफाई	(राजस्व)	23,85,39,65,000	—	23,85,39,65,000
		(पूंजीगत)	7,65,02,00,000	—	7,65,02,00,000

14	पशु पालन, दुग्ध विकास एवं मत्स्य	(राजस्व)	6,99,11,83,000	—	6,99,11,83,000
		(पूंजीगत)	24,25,39,000	—	24,25,39,000
15	योजना एवं पिछड़ा क्षेत्र विकास कार्यक्रम	(राजस्व)	1,04,20,32,000	—	1,04,20,32,000
		(पूंजीगत)	63,55,00,000	—	63,55,00,000
16	वन और वन्य जीवन	(राजस्व)	7,39,08,42,000	—	7,39,08,42,000
17	निर्वाचन	(राजस्व)	46,33,09,000	—	46,33,09,000
18	उद्योग, खनिज, आपूर्ति एवं सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी	(राजस्व)	75,34,35,000	—	75,34,35,000
19	सामाजिक न्याय एवं अधिकारिता	(राजस्व)	12,84,26,20,000	—	12,84,26,20,000
		(पूंजीगत)	10,56,00,000	—	10,56,00,000
20	ग्रामीण विकास	(राजस्व)	16,86,27,46,000	—	16,86,27,46,000
21	सहकारिता	(राजस्व)	48,80,97,000	—	48,80,97,000
22	खाद्य और नागरिक आपूर्ति	(राजस्व)	1,09,76,92,000	—	1,09,76,92,000
23	विद्युत विकास	(राजस्व)	2,07,99,92,000	—	2,07,99,92,000
		(पूंजीगत)	42,90,00,000	—	42,90,00,000
24	मुद्रण एवं लेखन सामग्री	(राजस्व)	22,21,61,000	—	22,21,61,000
25	सड़क और जल परिवहन	(राजस्व)	2,59,70,62,000	—	2,59,70,62,000
		(पूंजीगत)	23,01,00,000	—	23,01,00,000
26	पर्यटन और नागर विमानन	(राजस्व)	78,17,78,000	—	78,17,78,000
		(पूंजीगत)	1,97,43,00,000	—	1,97,43,00,000
27	श्रम, रोजगार और प्रशिक्षण	(राजस्व)	3,34,34,53,000	—	3,34,34,53,000
		(पूंजीगत)	32,00,000	—	32,00,000
28	शहरी विकास, नगर एवं ग्राम योजना तथा आवास	(राजस्व)	4,14,55,10,000	—	4,14,55,10,000
		(पूंजीगत)	39,49,00,000	—	39,49,00,000
29	वित्त	(राजस्व)	1,21,08,86,09,000	72,71,94,91,000	1,93,80,81,00,000
		(पूंजीगत)	1,80,02,000	48,40,39,32,000	48,42,19,34,000
30	विविध सामान्य सेवाएं	(राजस्व)	1,03,06,19,000	—	1,03,06,19,000
31	जनजातीय क्षेत्र विकास कार्यक्रम	(राजस्व)	16,44,22,20,000	—	16,44,22,20,000
		(पूंजीगत)	2,53,57,00,000	—	2,53,57,00,000

32	अनुसूचित जाति विकास कार्यक्रम	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	22,01,86,14,000 7,76,98,98,000	– –	22,01,86,14,000 7,76,98,98,000
	जोड़	**(राजस्व)** **(पूंजीगत)**	**4,32,53,23,46,000** **33,71,46,02,000**	**73,65,57,90,000** **48,40,39,32,000**	**5,06,18,81,36,000** **82,11,85,34,000**
		कुल जोड़	**4,66,24,69,48,000**	**1,22,05,97,22,000**	**5,88,30,66,70,000**

AUTHORITATIVE ENGLISH TEXT

Bill No. 3 of 2026.

THE HIMACHAL PRADESH APPROPRIATION (NUMBER 2) BILL, 2026

ARRANGEMENT OF CLAUSES

Clauses:

1. Short title and commencement.
2. Issue of a sum of ₹5,88,30,66,70,000 out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh for the financial year 2026-2027.
3. Appropriation.
4. Repeal and savings.

THE SCHEDULE

Bill No. 3 of 2026

THE HIMACHAL PRADESH APPROPRIATION (NUMBER 2) BILL, 2026

(AS INTRODUCED IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY)

A

BILL

to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh for the services for the financial year 2026-27.

BE it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of Himachal Pradesh in the Seventy-seventh Year of the Republic of India as follows:—

1. Short Tiltle and commencement.—(1) This Act may be called the Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (Number 2) Act, 2026.

(2) It shall come into force on the first day of April, 2026.

2. Issue of a sum of ₹ 5,88,30,66,70,000 out of the Consolidated fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh for the financial year 2026-2027.—From and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State Himachal Pradesh, there may be paid and applied sums not exceeding those specified in column (3) of THE SCHEDULE amounting in the aggregate to a sum of ₹ 5,88,30,66,70,000 (Rupees fifty eight thousand eight hundred thirty crore sixty six lakh seventy thousand) only towards defraying the several charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year 2026-2027 in respect of the services and purposes specified in column (2) of THE SCHEDULE.

3. Appropriaton.—The sum authorized to be paid and applied from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh by this Act shall be appropriated for the services and purposes expressed in THE SCHEDULE in relation to the said year.

4. Repeal and savings.—The Appropriation Acts specified below are hereby repealed, namely:—

(i) The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation Act, 2025 (Act No. 31 of 2025); and

(ii) The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (Number 2) Act, 2025 (Act No. 32 of 2025):

Provided that such repeal shall not,—

(a) affect any other enactment in which the repealed enactment has been applied, incorporated or referred to; or

(b) affect the validity, invalidity, effect or consequences of anything already done or suffered, or any right, title, obligation or liability already acquired or incurred or any remedy or proceeding in respect thereof, or any release or discharge of or from any debt, penalty, obligation, liability, claim or demand, or indemnity already granted, or the proof of any past act or thing; or

(c) affect any principle or rule of law, or established jurisdiction, form or course of pleading, practice or procedure, or existing privilege, restriction, exemption, office or appointment, notwithstanding that the same respectively may have been in any manner affirmed or recognized or derived by, in or from any enactment thereby repealed; or

(d) affect the audit, examination, accounting, investigation, inquiry or any other action taken or to be taken in relation thereto by any authority and such audit, examination, accounting, investigation, inquiry or action could be taken, and, or continued as if the said enactments are not repealed by this Act.

THE SCHEDULE

(*See* sections 2 and 3)

1	2		3		
Demand No.	Services and Purposes		Sums not exceeding		
			Voted by the Legislative Assembly in ₹	Charged on the Consolidated Fund in ₹	Total in ₹
01	Vidhan Sabha	(Revenue)	52,84,93,000	1,71,17,000	54,56,10,000
		(Capital)	3,15,00,000	-	3,15,00,000
02	Governor and Council of Ministers	(Revenue)	18,48,13,000	9,03,61,000	27,51,74,000
03	Administration of Justice	(Revenue)	2,64,81,88,000	68,55,88,000	3,33,37,76,000
		(Capital)	4,04,00,000	-	4,04,00,000
04	General Administration	(Revenue)	1,99,26,16,000	14,32,33,000	2,13,58,49,000
05	Land Revenue and District Administration	(Revenue)	16,15,35,13,000	-	16,15,35,13,000
06	Excise and Taxation	(Revenue)	1,23,53,75,000	-	1,23,53,75,000
07	Police and Allied Organisations	(Revenue)	17,48,38,69,000	-	17,48,38,69,000
		(Capital)	3,38,00,000	-	3,38,00,000
08	Education	(Revenue)	88,48,86,03,000	-	88,48,86,03,000
09	Health and Family Welfare	(Revenue)	27,04,54,01,000	-	27,04,54,01,000
		(Capital)	35,19,14,000	-	35,19,14,000
10	Public Works-Roads, Bridges and Buildings	(Revenue)	24,81,76,28,000	-	24,81,76,28,000
		(Capital)	11,04,82,00,000	-	11,04,82,00,000
11	Agriculture	(Revenue)	3,38,85,53,000	-	3,38,85,53,000
		(Capital)	16,05,37,000	-	16,05,37,000
12	Horticulture	(Revenue)	3,02,93,55,000	-	3,02,93,55,000
		(Capital)	5,93,12,000	-	5,93,12,000
13	Irrigation, Water Supply and Sanitation	(Revenue)	23,85,39,65,000	-	23,85,39,65,000
		(Capital)	7,65,02,00,000	-	7,65,02,00,000
14	Animal Husbandry, Dairy Development and Fisheries	(Revenue)	6,99,11,83,000	-	6,99,11,83,000
		(Capital)	24,25,39,000	-	24,25,39,000
15	Planning and Backward Area Development Programme	(Revenue)	1,04,20,32,000	-	1,04,20,32,000
		(Capital)	63,55,00,000	-	63,55,00,000

16	Forest and Wild Life	(Revenue)	7,39,08,42,000	-	7,39,08,42,000
17	Election	(Revenue)	46,33,09,000	-	46,33,09,000
18	Industries, Minerals, Supplies and Information Technology	(Revenue)	75,34,35,000	-	75,34,35,000
19	Social Justice and Empowerment	(Revenue) (Capital)	12,84,26,20,000 10,56,00,000	- -	12,84,26,20,000 10,56,00,000
20	Rural Development	(Revenue)	16,86,27,46,000	-	16,86,27,46,000
21	Co-operation	(Revenue)	48,80,97,000	-	48,80,97,000
22	Food and Civil Supplies	(Revenue)	1,09,76,92,000	-	1,09,76,92,000
23	Power Development	(Revenue) (Capital)	2,07,99,92,000 42,90,00,000	- -	2,07,99,92,000 42,90,00,000
24	Printing and Stationery	(Revenue)	22,21,61,000	-	22,21,61,000
25	Road and Water Transport	(Revenue) (Capital)	2,59,70,62,000 23,01,00,000	- -	2,59,70,62,000 23,01,00,000
26	Tourism and Civil Aviation	(Revenue) (Capital)	78,17,78,000 1,97,43,00,000	- -	78,17,78,000 1,97,43,00,000
27	Labour, Employment and Training	(Revenue) (Capital)	3,34,34,53,000 32,00,000	- -	3,34,34,53,000 32,00,000
28	Urban Development, Town and Country Planning and Housing	(Revenue) (Capital)	4,14,55,10,000 39,49,00,000	- -	4,14,55,10,000 39,49,00,000
29	Finance	(Revenue) (Capital)	1,21,08,86,09,000 1,80,02,000	72,71,94,91,000 48,40,39,32,000	1,93,80,81,00,000 48,42,19,34,000
30	Miscellaneous General Services	(Revenue)	1,03,06,19,000	-	1,03,06,19,000
31	Tribal Area Development Programme	(Revenue) (Capital)	16,44,22,20,000 2,53,57,00,000	- -	16,44,22,20,000 2,53,57,00,000
32	Scheduled Castes Development Programme	(Revenue) (Capital)	22,01,86,14,000 7,76,98,98,000	- -	22,01,86,14,000 7,76,98,98,000
		Total (Revenue)	**4,32,53,23,46,000**	**73,65,57,90,000**	**5,06,18,81,36,000**
		(Capital)	**33,71,46,02,000**	**48,40,39,32,000**	**82,11,85,34,000**
		Grand Total	**4,66,24,69,48,000**	**1,22,05,97,22,000**	**5,88,30,66,70,000**

विधि विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला–2, 30 मार्च, 2026

संख्याः एल.एल.आर.–डी.(6)–3 / 2026–लेज.–– हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल ने भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 200 के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग विधेयक, 2026 (2026 का विधेयक संख्यांक 1) को दिनांक 28–03–2026 को अनुमोदित कर दिया है तथा अनुच्छेद 348 के खण्ड (3) के अधीन, विधेयक के अंग्रेजी पाठ को राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत कर दिया है। अतः उपरोक्त विधेयक को वर्ष 2026 के अधिनियम संख्यांक 8 के रूप में अंग्रेजी प्राधिकृत पाठ सहित राजपत्र (ई–गजट) हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किया जाता है।

आदेश द्वारा,
हस्ताक्षरित / –
(डॉ0 विवेक ज्योति),
अतिरिक्त विधि परामर्शी एवं अतिरिक्त सचिव (विधि)।

————————

2026 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 8.

हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग अधिनियम, 2026

धाराओं का क्रम

धाराः

1. संक्षिप्त नाम ।
2. हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से वित्तीय वर्ष 2025–2026 के लिए ₹4,04,61,95,42,759 की और राशि जारी करना।
3. विनियोग ।

अनुसूची ।

————————

2026 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 8.

हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग अधिनियम, 2026

(माननीय राज्यपाल महोदय द्वारा तारीख 28 मार्च, 2026 को यथाअनुमोदित)

31 मार्च, 2026 को समाप्त होने वाले वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से सेवाओं के लिए कतिपय और धनराशियों के संदाय को प्राधिकृत करने और उनका विनियोग करने के लिए अधिनियम ।

भारत गणराज्य के सत्तहत्तरवें वर्ष में हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा द्वारा निम्नलिखित रूप में यह अधिनियमित हो :–

1. **संक्षिप्त नाम.**—इस अधिनियम का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग अधिनियम, 2026 है।

2. **हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से वित्तीय वर्ष 2025–2026 के लिए ₹4,04,61,95,42,759 की और राशि जारी करना.**—हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से अनुसूची के (तृतीय) स्तम्भ में विनिर्दिष्ट से अनधिक धनराशियां, जिनका योग केवल ₹4,04,61,95,42,759 (चालीस हजार चार सौ इकसठ करोड़ पचानवे लाख बयालीस हज़ार सात सौ उनसठ) है, संदत्त और उपयोजित की जाएं, जिनका वित्तीय वर्ष 2025–2026 की अवधि में अनुसूची के (द्वितीय) स्तम्भ में विनिर्दिष्ट सेवाओं और प्रयोजनों से सम्बन्धित विभिन्न प्रभारों को चुकाने के लिए उपयोग किया जाएगा।

3. **विनियोग.**—इस अधिनियम द्वारा हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से संदत्त और उपयोजित किए जाने के लिए प्राधिकृत धनराशियों का इस अधिनियम की धारा 2 के अधीन विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि से सम्बन्धित अनुसूची में अभिव्यक्त सेवाओं और प्रयोजनों के लिए विनियोजन किया जाएगा।

———————

अनुसूची

(धारा 2 और 3 देखें)

1	2		3		
मांग संख्या	सेवाएं और प्रयोजन		निम्नलिखित राशियों से अनधिक		
			विधान सभा द्वारा दत्तमत ₹ में	संचित निधि पर प्रभारित ₹ में	कुल ₹ में
01	विधान सभा	(राजस्व)	10,61,94,000	1,50,61,337	12,12,55,337
		(पूंजीगत)	6,72,35,000	—	6,72,35,000
02	राज्यपाल तथा मन्त्री परिषद्	(राजस्व)	5,93,60,717	1,48,09,000	7,41,69,717
03	न्याय प्रशासन	(राजस्व)	16,01,01,671	7,84,91,675	23,85,93,346
		(पूंजीगत)	19,83,44,000	11,23,30,446	31,06,74,446
04	सामान्य प्रशासन	(राजस्व)	37,71,39,823	2,63,83,731	40,35,23,554
		(पूंजीगत)	1,65,00,68,000	10,26,00,000	1,75,26,68,000
05	भू–राजस्व और जिला प्रशासन	(राजस्व)	34,35,09,97,322	2,85,25,564	34,37,95,22,886
		(पूंजीगत)	9,68,00,000	—	9,68,00,000
06	आबकारी और कराधान	(राजस्व)	60,06,63,611	2,23,16,237	62,29,79,848
		(पूंजीगत)	1,17,47,000	3,25,87,000	4,43,34,000
07	पुलिस और सम्बद्ध संगठन	(राजस्व)	2,000	4,82,73,923	4,82,75,923
		(पूंजीगत)	6,76,24,000	—	6,76,24,000
08	शिक्षा	(राजस्व)	21,000	38,20,77,326	38,20,98,326
		(पूंजीगत)	83,32,08,000	1,24,84,891	84,56,92,891
09	स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण	(राजस्व)	2,23,38,40,000	2,32,22,000	2,25,70,62,000
		(पूंजीगत)	5,59,43,34,000	5,15,43,000	5,64,58,77,000

10	लोक निर्माण–सड़क, पुल तथा भवन	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	– 10,69,71,69,000	3,53,25,000 65,54,06,500	3,53,25,000 11,35,25,75,500
11	कृषि	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	51,78,69,854 11,43,00,000	34,81,539 –	52,13,51,393 11,43,00,000
12	उद्यान	(राजस्व)	63,86,41,295	47,95,039	64,34,36,334
13	सिंचाई, जलापूर्ति एवं सफाई	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	4,87,94,57,064 4,24,07,90,601	1,57,65,767 51,12,09,316	4,89,52,22,831 4,75,19,99,917
14	पशुपालन, दुग्ध विकास एवं मत्स्य	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	9,98,44,390 16,95,01,000	8,41,46,107 –	18,39,90,497 16,95,01,000
15	योजना एवं पिछड़ा क्षेत्र विकास कार्यक्रम	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	37,85,346 1,89,12,31,000	5,30,520 –	43,15,866 1,89,12,31,000
16	वन और वन्य जीवन	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	9,000 2,00,00,000	94,54,701 –	94,63,701 2,00,00,000
17	निर्वाचन	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	18,26,50,561 2,24,09,000	12,00,000 –	18,38,50,561 2,24,09,000
18	उद्योग, खनिज, आपूर्ति और सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	23,07,62,667 15,73,83,000	1,08,24,60,361 48,93,355	1,31,32,23,028 16,22,76,355
19	सामाजिक न्याय एवं अधिकारिता	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	1,44,04,16,582 1,09,50,69,843	3,52,01,427 –	1,47,56,18,009 1,09,50,69,843
20	ग्रामीण विकास	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	5,62,60,94,187 2,27,00,000	98,58,751 –	5,63,59,52,938 2,27,00,000
21	सहकारिता	(राजस्व)	–	31,91,468	31,91,468
22	खाद्य और नागरिक आपूर्ति	(राजस्व)	29,68,04,953	10,54,584	29,78,59,537
23	विद्युत विकास	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	11,41,90,14,040 30,42,75,60,000	9,60,25,970 –	11,51,50,40,010 30,42,75,60,000
24	मुद्रण एवं लेखन सामग्री	(राजस्व)	67,73,056	47,491	68,20,547
25	सड़क और जल परिवहन	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	2,50,70,32,000 96,89,00,000	2,08,124 –	2,50,72,40,124 96,89,00,000
26	पर्यटन और नागर विमानन	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	32,42,88,403 96,34,39,348	2,25,310 –	32,45,13,713 96,34,39,348
27	श्रम, रोजगार और प्रशिक्षण	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	8,85,94,750 4,01,00,000	74,26,392 –	9,60,21,142 4,01,00,000
28	शहरी विकास, नगर एवं ग्राम योजना तथा आवास	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	5,20,33,15,647 90,00,00,000	5,00,000 –	5,20,38,15,647 90,00,00,000

29	वित्त	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	6,000 16,27,500	17,000 2,61,98,45,52,000	23,000 2,61,98,61,79,500
30	विविध सामान्य सेवाएं	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	16,11,53,498 1,18,33,43,000	1,76,121 —	16,13,29,619 1,18,33,43,000
31	जनजातीय क्षेत्र विकास कार्यक्रम	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	60,27,15,853 16,19,59,400	1,83,42,043 11,33,157	62,10,57,896 16,30,92,557
32	अनुसूचित जाति विकास कार्यक्रम	(राजस्व) (पूंजीगत)	4,60,11,87,448 78,42,61,156	5,25,000 18,43,000	4,60,17,12,448 78,61,04,156
	जोड़	**(राजस्व)**	**76,71,87,36,738**	**2,04,91,19,508**	**78,76,78,56,246**
		(पूंजीगत)	**62,38,11,03,848**	**2,63,47,05,82,665**	**3,25,85,16,86,513**
	कुल जोड़		**1,39,09,98,40,586**	**2,65,51,97,02,173**	**4,04,61,95,42,759**

AUTHORITATIVE ENGLISH TEXT

Act No. 8 of 2026.

THE HIMACHAL PRADESH APPROPRIATION ACT, 2026

ARRANGEMENT OF SECTIONS

Sections:

1. Short title.
2. Issue of a further sum of ₹4,04,61,95,42,759 out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh for the financial year 2025-2026.
3. Appropriation.

THE SCHEDULE.

Act No. 8 of 2026.

THE HIMACHAL PRADESH APPROPRIATION ACT, 2026

(AS ASSENTED TO BY THE GOVERNOR ON 28TH MARCH, 2026)

AN

ACT

to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh for the services for the financial year ending on 31st day of March, 2026.

BE it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of Himachal Pradesh in the Seventy-seventh Year of the Republic of India as follows:—

1. Short title.—This Act may be called the Himachal Pradesh Appropriation Act, 2026.

2. Issue of a further sum of ₹4,04,61,95,42,759 out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh for the financial year 2025-2026.—From and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh, there may be paid and applied sums not exceeding those specified in column (3) of THE SCHEDULE amounting in the aggregate to a sum of ₹4,04,61,95,42,759 (Rupees forty thousand four hundred sixty one crore ninety five lakh forty two thousand seven hundred fifty nine) only towards defraying the several charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year 2025-2026 in respect of the services and purposes specified in column (2) of THE SCHEDULE.

3. Appropriation.—The sums authorized to be paid and applied from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh by this Act shall be further appropriated for the services and purposes expressed in THE SCHEDULE in relation to the period specified under section 2 of this Act.

THE SCHEDULE

(*See* sections 2 and 3)

1	2	3		
Demand No.	**Services and purposes**	**Sums not exceeding**		
		Voted by the Legislative Assembly in ₹	Charged on the Consolidated Fund in ₹	Total in ₹
01	Vidhan Sabha (Revenue) (Capital)	10,61,94,000 6,72,35,000	1,50,61,337 _	12,12,55,337 6,72,35,000
02	Governor and Council of Ministers (Revenue)	5,93,60,717	1,48,09,000	7,41,69,717
03	Administration of Justice (Revenue) (Capital)	16,01,01,671 19,83,44,000	7,84,91,675 11,23,30,446	23,85,93,346 31,06,74,446
04	General Administration (Revenue) (Capital)	37,71,39,823 1,65,00,68,000	2,63,83,731 10,26,00,000	40,35,23,554 1,75,26,68,000
05	Land Revenue and District Administration (Revenue) (Capital)	34,35,09,97,322 9,68,00,000	2,85,25,564 _	34,37,95,22,886 9,68,00,000
06	Excise and Taxation (Revenue) (Capital)	60,06,63,611 1,17,47,000	2,23,16,237 3,25,87,000	62,29,79,848 4,43,34,000
07	Police and Allied Organisations (Revenue) (Capital)	2,000 6,76,24,000	4,82,73,923 _	4,82,75,923 6,76,24,000
08	Education (Revenue) (Capital)	21,000 83,32,08,000	38,20,77,326 1,24,84,891	38,20,98,326 84,56,92,891

09	Health and Family Welfare	(Revenue) (Capital)	2,23,38,40,000 5,59,43,34,000	2,32,22,000 5,15,43,000	2,25,70,62,000 5,64,58,77,000
10	Public Works-Roads, Bridges and Buildings	(Revenue) (Capital)	_ 10,69,71,69,000	3,53,25,000 65,54,06,500	3,53,25,000 11,35,25,75,500
11	Agriculture	(Revenue) (Capital)	51,78,69,854 11,43,00,000	34,81,539 _	52,13,51,393 11,43,00,000
12	Horticulture	(Revenue)	63,86,41,295	47,95,039	64,34,36,334
13	Irrigation, Water Supply and Sanitation	(Revenue) (Capital)	4,87,94,57,064 4,24,07,90,601	1,57,65,767 51,12,09,316	4,89,52,22,831 4,75,19,99,917
14	Animal Husbandry, Dairy Development and Fisheries	(Revenue) (Capital)	9,98,44,390 16,95,01,000	8,41,46,107 _	18,39,90,497 16,95,01,000
15	Planning and Backward Area Development Programme	(Revenue) (Capital)	37,85,346 1,89,12,31,000	5,30,520 _	43,15,866 1,89,12,31,000
16	Forest and Wild Life	(Revenue) (Capital)	9,000 2,00,00,000	94,54,701 _	94,63,701 2,00,00,000
17	Election	(Revenue) (Capital)	18,26,50,561 2,24,09,000	12,00,000 _	18,38,50,561 2,24,09,000
18	Industries, Minerals, Supplies and Information Technology	(Revenue) (Capital)	23,07,62,667 15,73,83,000	1,08,24,60,361 48,93,355	1,31,32,23,028 16,22,76,355
19	Social Justice and Empowerment	(Revenue) (Capital)	1,44,04,16,582 1,09,50,69,843	3,52,01,427 _	1,47,56,18,009 1,09,50,69,843
20	Rural Development	(Revenue) (Capital)	5,62,60,94,187 2,27,00,000	98,58,751 _	5,63,59,52,938 2,27,00,000
21	Co-operation	(Revenue)	_	31,91,468	31,91,468
22	Food and Civil Supplies	(Revenue)	29,68,04,953	10,54,584	29,78,59,537
23	Power Development	(Revenue) (Capital)	11,41,90,14,040 30,42,75,60,000	9,60,25,970 _	11,51,50,40,010 30,42,75,60,000

24	Printing and Stationery	(Revenue)	67,73,056	47,491	68,20,547
25	Road and Water Transport	(Revenue) (Capital)	2,50,70,32,000 96,89,00,000	2,08,124 _	2,50,72,40,124 96,89,00,000
26	Tourism and Civil Aviation	(Revenue) (Capital)	32,42,88,403 96,34,39,348	2,25,310 _	32,45,13,713 96,34,39,348
27	Labour, Employment and Training	(Revenue) (Capital)	8,85,94,750 4,01,00,000	74,26,392 _	9,60,21,142 4,01,00,000
28	Urban Development, Town and Country Planning and Housing	(Revenue) (Capital)	5,20,33,15,647 90,00,00,000	5,00,000 _	5,20,38,15,647 90,00,00,000
29	Finance	(Revenue) (Capital)	6,000 16,27,500	17,000 2,61,98,45,52,000	23,000 2,61,98,61,79,500
30	Miscellaneous General Services	(Revenue) (Capital)	16,11,53,498 1,18,33,43,000	1,76,121 _	16,13,29,619 1,18,33,43,000
31	Tribal Area Development Programme	(Revenue) (Capital)	60,27,15,853 16,19,59,400	1,83,42,043 11,33,157	62,10,57,896 16,30,92,557
32	Scheduled Castes Development Programme	(Revenue) (Capital)	4,60,11,87,448 78,42,61,156	5,25,000 18,43,000	4,60,17,12,448 78,61,04,156
	Total	**(Revenue)**	**76,71,87,36,738**	**2,04,91,19,508**	**78,76,78,56,246**
		(Capital)	**62,38,11,03,848**	**2,63,47,05,82,665**	**3,25,85,16,86,513**
	Grand Total		**1,39,09,98,40,586**	**2,65,51,97,02,173**	**4,04,61,95,42,759**

THE REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY HIMACHAL PRADESH

NOTIFICATION

Shimla -2, 31st March, 2026

No. /HP/RERA-(A)-3-2/Regulations/2023/Vol-1-3473.—In exercise of the powers conferred under section 85 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (Act No. 16 of 2016) read with the Himachal Pradesh Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 and all other powers enabling it on that behalf, the Himachal Pradesh Real Estate Regulatory Authority, hereby makes the following Regulation:

1. Short title and commencement.—(1) This Regulation may be called the Himachal Pradesh Real Estate Regulatory Authority "(**Mandatory Bank Accounts)**" **Regulation No.7 of 2026.**

(2) This Regulation shall come into force from the date of its publication in the Official Gazette of Himachal Pradesh.

(3) This Regulation shall apply to all registered real estate projects and promoters who have applied for registration of real estate projects falling within the jurisdiction of the Authority in the State of Himachal Pradesh**.**

CHAPTER-I

PRELIMINARY

2. Definitions:

(1) In these Regulation, unless the context otherwise requires:

(i) **"Act"** means the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016

(ii) "**Authority"** means the Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Himachal Pradesh, established under sub-section (1) of section 20 of the Act.

(iii) "**no lien account"** means bank account without any third-party rights or security interests;

(iv) **"no lien fixed deposit"** means fixed deposit without any third-party rights or security interests.

(2) Words and expressions used but not defined in these Regulation, but defined in the Act or the Rules, as the case may be, shall have the same meaning respectively as assigned to them in the Act or the Rules.

3. Purpose:

This regulation is are meant to define the types and categories of the accounts required to be opened by the promoter prior to registration of the project with the Authority, prescribe purpose and procedures for utilization of funds collected from the allottees and closure of accounts on completion of the projects.

CHAPTER II

PROJECT ACCOUNTS

4. Mandatory project accounts to be opened by the promoter:

(1) **Every promoter of real estate project shall open three bank accounts before registration of project, namely 'Project Master Account', 'Project RERA Escrow Account' and 'Project Free Account'.**

CHAPTER III

NATURE OF PROJECT ACCOUNTS

5. Nature of 'Project Master Account':

(1) The 'Project Master Account' shall be a separate bank account to be maintained by the promoter in a scheduled bank, wherein 100% receivables from the allottees shall be deposited; this account shall be free from all encumbrances, lien, loan and control of any third party, i.e. lender / bank / financial institution; this account must be mentioned in the application form, builder-buyer agreement & other documents wherever required; this account can only be changed with the prior written permission of the Authority.

(2) The bank wherein the 'Project Master Account' has been opened shall ensure that no debit or withdrawal is permitted from this account by way of cheque, debit card, credit card or net banking facility or any other means (e.g., demand draft, bank guarantee etc.) except through auto-sweep of seventy percent of the amount to the 'Project RERA Escrow Account' and not more than thirty percent of the amount to the 'Project Free Account'.

6. Nature of 'Project RERA Escrow Account':

(1) The 'Project RERA Escrow Account' shall be a separate bank account to be maintained by the promoter in a scheduled bank wherein seventy percent of the amount realised from the allottees of the project is to be deposited as per section 4(2)(l)(D) of the Act to cover the cost of land and construction of the project. This account shall be free from all encumbrances, lien, loan and control of any third party i.e. lender / bank / financial institution.

(2) The seventy percent amount from the "Master Account" shall be transferred to this account automatically at the end of each business day. The funds shall be released from this account upon submission of relevant certificates as per the provisions of the Act. This account is in the nature of reimbursement account for reimbursement of expenditure incurred and paid on proportionate land cost and construction cost.

(3) The promoter shall withdraw the amounts from this account to cover the cost of land and construction only, in proportion to the percentage of completion of the project. The project engineer, project architect and project chartered accountant shall certify before the amount is withdrawn that withdrawal being made is in proportion to the percentage of completion of the project.

7. Nature of 'Project Free Account':

(1) The 'Project Free Account' shall be a separate bank account to be maintained by the promoter in a scheduled bank wherein the residual amount of thirty percent after depositing seventy percent of the amount realised from the allottees in 'RERA Escrow Account' shall be kept. The thirty percent amount from the 'Project Master Account' shall be transferred to this account automatically at the end of each business day.

(2) The promoter may use the funds available in this account for business activities related to the same project provided the Authority has not issued any directions to the contrary.

CHAPTER IV

OPENING AND OPERATION OF ACCOUNTS

8. Opening and operation of Project Master Account of the Project:

(1) The promoter shall maintain the 'Project Master Account' for each project registered with the Authority separately.

(2) 'Project Master Account' opened in a scheduled bank shall have the name of the project along with the name of the account holder. For example, if the name of the promoter is M/s ABC Ltd., and the name of the project is XYZ, then the description of the account will be 'Project Master Account of ABC Ltd. for project XYZ.'

(3) The promoter shall give an affidavit in H.P. RERA in **Form 1** incorporating the standing advice given by it to the bank for auto-transfer of not less than seventy percent of the amount collected from the allottees in the account to the 'Project RERA Escrow Account' and not more than thirty percent of the amount to the 'Project Free Account.'

(4) No cheque book, debit card, credit card, net banking facility shall be allowed on this account.

(5) The promoter shall publish the particulars of the 'Project RERA Escrow Account' in every advertisement, prospectus / brochure of the project and also on the Allotment Letter, Agreement for Sale and / or any other document for communication with the existing / prospective homebuyers for the purposes of receiving payments for the project.

9. Opening and operation of Project RERA Escrow Account:

(1) Every promoter shall maintain a 'Project RERA Escrow Account' for every project registered with the Authority, HP separately.

(2) The 'Project RERA Escrow Account' opened shall have the name of the project alongwith the name of the holder of the promoter of the project. For example, if the name of the promoter is **M/s ABC** Ltd., and the name of the project is **XYZ**, then the name of the account should reflect as '**ABC RERA** Escrow Account for **XYZ'.**

(3) No cheque book, debit card, credit card, net banking facility shall be allowed on this account.

(4) The money from this account shall be utilised only for meeting the following expenditures incurred on the project:

(i) Cost for acquisition of land, payment of external and internal development cost, obtaining charges, development rights, additional FAR, if any, before completion of project, TDR (Transfer of Development Rights), legal expenses, stamp duty, transfer charges and registration;

(ii) Cost including fees etc. of construction including common facilities;

(iii) Costs of obtaining project related clearances etc.;

(iv) Cost of obtaining project related services like water, electricity etc.;

(v) Hire charges for machinery and equipment and depreciation cost of machinery and equipment purchased so long these costs are directly incurred for construction of the concerned project;

(vi) Repayment of principal amount of loan except payment of interest;

(vii) Cost of services of consultants like Chartered Accountant, Architect, Engineers etc.;

(viii) Payment of refund to the allottees on cancellation or withdrawal (only up to seventy percent); and

(ix) Cost of site office of the project and staff.

(5) No expenditure shall be made from this account for any other purpose like advertisements & marketing of the project, payment of penalties, fines, interest on capital, assured return, commitment charges or any other incentive, by whatever name called.

(6) No credits other than the seventy percent amount from the 'Project Master Account' and secured / unsecured finances availed shall be allowed in the "Project RERA Escrow Account'. In case of a project, where the estimated cost to complete the project is higher than estimated amount of total receivables at any stage, hundred percent of the amount collected from the allottees (other than pass through charges and indirect taxes) shall be deposited in the "Project RERA Escrow Account" till situation is eased out.

(7) All the secured and unsecured loans availed to finance the project shall also be deposited in this 'Project RERA Escrow Account'. The secured financing shall also include any amount received through issuance of Non-Convertible Debentures (NCDs) where the project assets are mortgaged to debenture holders.

(8) The money lying in the 'Project RERA Escrow Account' may be put in fixed deposits with the bank operating the 'Project RERA Escrow Account' provided it is a 'No Lien Fixed Deposit' and the promoter shall avail no loan against such fixed deposits or create any charge on them. The interest earned from such deposits shall only be utilized towards cost of land and construction.

(9) The promoter as well as the banks shall ensure that no withdrawals from this account are made without the three certificates given by the Architect, Engineer and Chartered Accountant of the project in format prescribed under Annexure-6,

Annexure -7, and Annexure- 8, respectively certifying that the withdrawal is in proportion to the percentage of completion of the project, as mandated as per section 4 (2) (l) (D) of the Act. The promoter shall ensure that every certificate signed by the Architect and the Chartered Accountant bears their Registration or Unique Document Identification Number (UDIN) and seal of completion of the project, as mandated as per section 4 (2) (1) (D) of the Act.

(10)The Promoter shall be eligible to withdraw the cost towards the land from the 'Project RERA Escrow Account' only in proportion to the construction completed.

10. Operation of Project RERA Free Account.—(1) The promoter shall maintain a 'Project Free Account' for each project registered with H.P. RERA separately.

(2) The 'Project Free Account' shall have the name of the project alongwith the name of the holder of the Project Master Account. For example, if the name of the Promoter is M/s ABC Ltd. and the name of the project is XYZ, then the name of the account should reflect as 'ABC - RERA Free Account for XYZ Project'.

(3) Only upto thirty percent of the total amount received from the allottees of the project can be transferred to this account.

(4) The account shall be used for meeting all expenses other than directly related to the construction of the project like release of advertisements, payment of interest on loans, refunds to the allottees on cancellation or withdrawal only upto 30 percent and interest on refund, delayed possession charges and compensation.

CHAPTER V

COST OF LAND

11. Calculation of land cost and construction cost shall cost of real estate project.— (1) The land cost shall be the cost paid or incurred by the promoter to make an outright purchases, obtaining development rights (as per collaboration agreement), lease including registration charges, stamp duty and brokerage cost etc. and such cost shall be declared by the promoter at the time of registration.

(2) The construction cost shall be the cost incurred by the promoter, towards the on-site expenditure for the physical development of the project inclusive of all statutory charges as well as external development charges (EDC) and infrastructural development charges.

CHAPTER VI

LOAN ON PROJECT OR LAND

12. Details of loan and other encumbrances at the time of registration of the project.— The promoter shall provide details of all secured and unsecured loans and encumbrances created on the land of the project or project at the time of registration of the project, giving name of the lender, address of the lender, date of borrowing & disbursement, amount sanctioned, amount disbursed, amount outstanding, details of mortgage and mode of repayment.

13. Availing of loan by the promoter after registration.—(1) The promoter, after executing an agreement for sale for any apartment, plot or building, as the case may be, shall not mortgage or create a charge on such apartment, plot or building, as the case may be, and if any such mortgage or charge is made or created then notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, it shall not affect the right and interest of the allottee who has taken or agreed to take such apartment, plot or building, as the case may be.

(2) The promoter shall inform the Authority in writing within thirty days of availing any loan or creation of mortgage on project land or project or both, after registration of the project, giving reasons for availing such a loan and its impact on the project cost.

(3) The promoter, if availing any loan on the project or land for the project shall deposit the loan amount either in 'Project RERA Escrow Account' or 'Joint Escrow Account' to be operated by the lender and the promoter as allowed by the Authority.

(4) The loan taken against land or the project, shall be utilized for meeting the cost of land and construction of project only. Withdrawals from the 'Joint Escrow Account' shall also be done as per the procedure followed for withdrawals from the 'Project RERA Escrow Account'.

CHAPTER VII

CHANGE OF BANK ACCOUNTS

14. Change of bank accounts.—(1) **The promoter shall not change any project account, ' Project Master Account' 'Project RERA Escrow Account' and 'Project Free Account' form one bank to another.**

(2) However, in **exceptional cases**, where there is a genuine necessity or requirement, the Authority may allow a change of project bank account. In such cases, the promoter may apply for the change through the **updation module** available on the HP RERA website.

(3) The application must include;

a. Reason for the change of the bank account.
b. Necessary documents supporting the request.
c. Detail of the balance amount remaining in the current bank account, if any.
d. Affidavit of the Promoter stating that the existing balance has been transferred to the new account.
e. Certificate from the Chartered Accountant confirming that all amounts have been transferred to the new account.

CHAPTER VIII

REPORTING TO THE AUTHORITY

15. Reporting of expenditure from the 'Project RERA Escrow Account':

The Promoter shall upload the certificates issued by the Architect, Engineer, and Chartered Accountant, certifying that the expenditure incurred during the last quarter is in proportion to the

percentage of completion of the project, in accordance with Section 4(2)(l)(D) of the Act, as part of the Quarterly Returns/Reports (QRR).

The various annexures and certificates to be submitted by professionals along with the Quarterly Progress Reports (QPR) / Annual Progress Reports (APR) are specified in Table No. 12 of the QPR Form. However, the certificates issued by the Architect, Engineer, and Chartered Accountant are included under Annexures 6 to 12 of HP RERA(QPR) Regulation-2.

16. Auditing and submission of Annual Accounts of the project:

Every promoter shall have the project accounts audited within six months after the end of every financial year by a chartered accountant in practice and submit with Annual Report. It shall be verified during the audit that the amounts collected for a particular project have been utilised for the project and the withdrawals have been in compliance with the proportion to the percentage of completion of the project.

17. Penalty for submission of defective Audited Accounts statements or false information in Audited Accounts Statement or non-submission of the Audited Accounts Statements by the Promoter.—(1) The Authority may levy a penalty up to **the maximum prescribed under section 61 of the Act** and/or revoke registration for non-submission of project Audited Account or submission of defective Audited Accounts or false information in Audited Accounts:

Provided that no penalty shall be levied as above or registration revoked unless an opportunity of being heard is given to the promoter.

(2) For the purposes of sub-clause (1) above, a **defective Audited Accounts Statement** shall be one which is either not complete or is not accompanied by the relevant/mandatory documents.

(3) If any Chartered Accountant, Architect, or Engineer, as approved by the Authority at the time of project registration, is found to have made a false statement or certification while permitting withdrawal from the project's RERA escrow account, the Authority shall inform the concerned regulatory body, such as the ICAI, Council of Architecture, or other relevant body, for taking necessary action against such professional.

CHAPTER IX

POWERS OF THE AUTHORITY

18. Audit, inspection and scrutiny of project accounts.—(1) The Authority may at any time order an **audit of accounts** or inspection of books of accounts, ledgers, bank statements, vouchers, documents and records maintained by the promoter in respect of any project. (2) The Authority may require the promoter to produce any information, documents or explanations in relation to the project accounts that it may deem necessary to verify compliance with these Directions and the provisions of the Act and the Rules.

19. Penalty for misappropriation or mis-utilization of funds:

(1) The promoter shall be liable for any misappropriation or mis-utilization of funds from project accounts in violation of the Act, the Rules and these Regulations.

(2) On satisfaction of misappropriation or mis-utilization of funds by the promoter, the Authority may recommend **criminal action** against the promoter under relevant provisions of the Act; and/or

revoke the registration of the project after giving an opportunity of being heard to the promoter.

20. Powers of Authority to freeze or de-freeze accounts:

(1) Upon revocation of the registration of the project, the Authority shall direct the bank holding the project accounts to **freeze the accounts** and thereafter take such further necessary actions, including consequent de-freezing of the said accounts, for facilitating the remaining development work of the project in accordance with the provisions of the Section 8 of the Act.

(2) The Authority may require the promoter to furnish such information relating to the accounts of the project as it may deem fit in the interest of the allottees or get the bank accounts of the project, along with any other account(s) in which the money collected from the allottees of the project or raised by way of project finance, verified/audited by an auditing firm/auditor/chartered accountant from time to time in discharge of its functions. The promoter shall promptly provide such information, facilitate such auditors or chartered accountants and provide all the information and documents as may be required to complete such verification or audit, as the case may be, under the orders of the Authority.

(3) The cost of such audit or verification of the accounts of the project shall be borne by the promoter in the manner as decided by the Authority.

CHAPTER X

OBLIGATION OF BANKS

21. Obligations of Banks:

(1) Banks shall warrant promoters to open and maintain **three bank accounts** namely 'Project Master Account', 'Project RERA Escrow Account' and 'Project Free Account' for all projects registered with the Authority.

(2) Banks shall follow the nomenclature prescribed in these Directions for the three bank accounts.

(3) Banks shall send to the Authority details of the three accounts opened, certifying having received instructions as detailed in **Form 1** within **fifteen days** of opening of accounts.

(4) No cheque book, debit card, credit card, net banking facility shall be allowed on the **Project Master Account**.

(5) Banks shall be **obliged to automatically transfer**:

- **70%** of the funds deposited in the **Project Master Account** to the **Project RERA Escrow Account**, and

- **Not more than 30%** of the funds to the **Project Free Account**.
  This ensures compliance with the fund allocation requirements prescribed under HP RERA.

(6) Banks shall ensure that the withdrawals/transfers from the **Project RERA Escrow Account** are made directly to the biller or vendor or contractor as certified respectively by the chartered accountant, architect and Engineer as approved by the Authority while registering the project.

(7) Banks shall not allow any lien by any bank, NBFC, lender and/or investor or by any institution/person etc. to be placed on the **Project RERA Escrow Account**.

(8) In case of any suspicion on the quantum of withdrawal made admissible from the 'Project Master Account', the concerned bank must bring the issue to the knowledge of the Authority before allowing the withdrawal.

(9) Banks must ensure that the certificate(s) signed by the Chartered Accountant necessarily includes **UDIN (Unique Document Identification Number)**.

(10) Banks shall stop the withdrawals/transfers from the 'Project RERA Escrow Account' immediately upon lapse of validity of registration of the project.

CHAPTER XI

CLOSURE OF PROJECT ACCOUNTS

22. Closure of the Project Bank Accounts on completion of the Project.—(1) The Authority may permit the promoter to close the project accounts after completion of the project and fulfillment of conditions provided under section 11 of the Act.

(2) The promoter shall apply to the Authority for its permission to close the project accounts after receipt of the **completion/occupancy certificate** for the project from the competent authority, with the following documents:

(i) Completion/occupancy certificate from the competent authority;

(ii) Architect's and Structural Engineer's certificate in **form 2**

(iii) List of total number of allottees giving details of their units and parking slots;

(iv) Details of balance in three accounts;

(v) Copies of Annual Statement of Accounts for all financial years since registration of the project;

(vi) Chartered Accountant's certificate in **form 3**

(vii) An affidavit in **Form 4** duly certified by the authorised signatory of the promoter that it has paid all the outgoings as provided under section 11(4)(g) of the Act;

(viii) An affidavit that an Association of Allottees has been formed and that all common facilities have been handed over to the Association of Allottees;

(ix) An affidavit confirming that all the liabilities pertaining to orders of refund, penalties or late fee etc., passed by HP-RERA as per the provisions of the Act, the Rules, the Regulations and Directions have been discharged by the promoter.

(3) The Authority, after examining the application, may grant permission to the promoter to close the project accounts and withdraw the balance, if any. However, the promoter will not be absolved of the responsibilities un-discharged and not disclosed by it to the Authority at the time of the application for closure of the project accounts, and of liabilities under section 14(3) of the Act:

Provided that a Bank Guarantee equivalent to 2% of the total funds received in the Project RERA Escrow Account shall be submitted by the Promoter, with a validity of 5 years to cover the defect liability period.

CHAPTER XII

MISCELLANEOUS

23. Violation of these Directions.—Any violation of these Directions shall be punishable under section 61 of the Act, 2016 and may also result in revocation of the registration.

25. Interpretation of Directions.—If any doubt arises as to the interpretation of these Regulations, the decision of the Authority shall be final and binding on all concerned.

Form-1

Affidavit for Bank Accounts of Project
(Notarized) (For New Registration only)

To,

The Chairperson,
Real Estate Regulatory Authority,
Himachal Pradesh, Shimla -171002.

Sub.—Affidavit/Declaration for Bank Accounts for the Project

Sir

I,……Promoter of the ……..project / authorized signatory of the Promoter of the…….project, do hereby solemnly declare, undertake and state that the following bank accounts have been opened for the project……(Name of Project).

I certify that I have given written standing advice to the bank where three project accounts have been opened for instant auto transfer of 70 percent of the money collected from allottees in "Project Master Account" to the "Project RERA ESCROW Account" and not more than 30 percent to the "Project Free Account" of the project.

Sl .	Detail	Project Master Account	Project RERA ESCROW Account	Project Free Account
1.	Name Account			
2.	Account Number			
3.	Bank Name			
4.	Branch Address			
5.	IFSC Code			
6.	Branch Email ID			
7.	Branch Phone no.			

Deponent

Verification

The Contents of this Affidavit cum Declaration are true and correct nothing material and has been concealed by me therefrom.

Verified by me at……..on this……..date of……

Deponent.

Form2
(ARCHITECT'S AND STRUCTURAL ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATE)
To be issued on completion of entire project

Date:

To

The Chairperson,
Real Estate Regulatory Authority,
Himachal Pradesh, Shimla -171002.

Subject.—Certificate on completion for the construction work of ……. Project with all common facilities and infrastructure.

Sir,

We…… had undertaken assignment as project Architect/ Project Structural Engineer for construction work of …….project located at…… and bearing RERA Registration No. …… and we certify that the project …….has been completed with all common facilities and infrastructure as per sanction plans/revised sanctioned plans dated …… approved by …… and no deviation has been found. A detailed report is enclosed

Your faithfully

Sd/-
Mr/Ms/Mrs……
Structural Engineer.

Form 3
CA's CERTIFICATE
(To be issued on completion of entire project)

Date:

To,

The Chairperson,
Real Estate Regulatory Authority,
Himachal Pradesh, Shimla -171002.

Subject.—Certificate on completion of……..project with all common facilities and infrastructure.

Sir,

I hereby certify that all monies received by way of payments by the allottees and loan have been spent as per the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 provisions on the project only and no amount has been misappropriated, diverted or spent on any other project. At present there are no outstanding liabilities on the project or land for the project and both the project and project land are encumbrance free. As on date the balance in three project accounts is as follows:—

Project Master Account Project
RERA Escrow Account
Project Free Account

Your faithfully

Sd/-

CA's Signature: Name (IN BLOCK LETTERS) with (UDIN No).

Form 4-Affidavit (Notarized)

I,……..age years, Promoter of the Real Estate Project / authorized representative of the Promoter, *vide* authorization dated……., do hereby solemnly declare, undertake and state on oath in compliance of Section 17 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 as under:—

1. That, the project……registered with HP RERA *vide* Registration no…….dated…… has been completed as per building plans / revised building plans sanctioned by the competent authority *i.e*……dated…….with no deviation or with deviations which have been regularized vide competent authority's order no……..dated……..

2. That, the Completion /Occupancy Certificate no……..dated……issued by……has been received for……project.

3. That, all the development works, services, common areas and facilities, EWS component of the said project have been completed and are ready to use.

4. That, till date out of the total……units,…….number of units have been booked and……..number of units are still pending for sale.

5. That, no loan has been availed or all loans have been paid off, and as such there is no encumbrance on the legal titles or rights of the Allottees or the Association of Allottees of ……..project.

6. That, all outstanding dues to the Government Authorities have been paid and presently there is no liability on the project except……...

7. That all the liabilities pertaining to orders of refund, penalties or late fee etc., passed by HP RERA, as the per the provisions of the Act, the Rules, the Regulations and Directions have been discharged.

8. That, the Project Architect Mr./Ms./Mrs……whose COA no. is……and Structural Engineer Mr. / Ms. / Mrs……..have given **Form……**

9. That, Chartered Accountant, Mr./Ms./Mrs…….Registration no…….has given **Form…….**

The Contents of this Affidavit cum Declaration are true and correct and nothing material has been concealed.

Deponent.

Verified by me at……on this……date of…….

Deponent.

_____

_____

ब अदालत श्री धर्मपाल, उप–मण्डल अधिकारी (नागरिक), श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

गगनीत कौर पुत्री श्री जरनैल सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर मजारी, ग्राम पंचायत मजारी, तहसील श्री नैना देवी जी, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

1. आम जनता,
2. प्रधान, ग्राम पंचायत मजारी, तहसील श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट, जिला बिलासपुर।

विषय.––प्रार्थिया का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत मजारी के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाए जाने बारे कि अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म पंजीकरण करने बारे।

हर खास व आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थिया गगनीत कौर पुत्री श्री जरनैल सिंह ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसने अपना नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत मजारी के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है। अब प्रार्थिया अपना नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत मजारी के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है, जो कि निम्न प्रकार से है:––

क्र0 सं0	नाम	सम्बन्ध	जन्म तारीख
1.	गगनीत कौर	पुत्री श्री जरनैल सिंह	19–01–1998

अतः ग्राम पंचायत मजारी, तहसील श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट की जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह तारीख 16–04–2026 को या इससे पूर्व असालतन व वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा आवेदन–पत्र पर जन्म पंजीकरण आदेश पारित करके सचिव, ग्राम पंचायत मजारी को आगामी कार्यान्वयन हेतु भेज दिया जाएगा।

आज तारीख 16–03–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
(धर्मपाल, हि0प्र0से0),
उप–मण्डल अधिकारी (नागरिक),
श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट,
जिला बिलासपुर (हि0प्र0)।

––––––––

ब अदालत श्री धर्मपाल, उप–मण्डल अधिकारी (नागरिक), श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

कर्मदीन पुत्र श्री नूरदीन, निवासी गांव दगडाहन डाकघर जकातखाना, ग्राम पंचायत टाली, तहसील श्री नैना देवी जी, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

1. आम जनता,
2. प्रधान, ग्राम पंचायत टाली, तहसील श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट, जिला बिलासपुर।

विषय.––प्रार्थी का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत मजारी के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाए जाने बारे कि अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म पंजीकरण करने बारे।

हर खास व आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी कर्मदीन पुत्र श्री नूरदीन ने अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में एक आवेदन–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसने अपना नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत टाली के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है। अब प्रार्थी अपना नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत टाली के जन्म पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है, जो कि निम्न प्रकार से हैः––

क्र0 सं0	नाम	सम्बन्ध	जन्म तारीख
1.	कर्मदीन	पुत्र श्री नूरदीन	24–10–1956

अतः ग्राम पंचायत मजारी, तहसील श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट की जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह तारीख 16–04–2026 को या इससे पूर्व असालतन व वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा आवेदन–पत्र पर जन्म पंजीकरण आदेश पारित करके सचिव, ग्राम पंचायत मजारी को आगामी कार्यान्वयन हेतु भेज दिया जाएगा।

आज तारीख 16–03–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
(धर्मपाल, हि0प्र0से0),
उप–मण्डल अधिकारी (नागरिक),
श्री नैना देवी जी स्थित स्वारघाट,
जिला बिलासपुर (हि0प्र0)।

––––––––

In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HAS, Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur, (H.P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Subhash Chand s/o Sh. Jag Jeevan, r/o V.P.O. Bharthian, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.)

2. Smt. Lata Devi d/o Sh. Nag Ram, r/o Vill. Kadhar (Ghatasini), P.O. Guma, Tehsil Joginder Nagar, District Mandi (H.P.) ..... *Applicants*.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Subhash Chand and Smt. Lata Devi have filed an application U/S 15 & 16 of Special Marriages Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents in this court of undersigned, stating therein that their marriage ceremony has been performed on 14-02-2026 at Gasota Mahadev Mandir at Gasota, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.) according to Hindu rites and customs.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 06-04-2026. In case no objection is received by 06-04-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 19-03-2026.

Seal. Sd/-

Marriage Officer-cum-*SDM,*
Sub-Divisional Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HAS, Marriage Officer-cum-**Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur, (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Sunil Kumar s/o Sh. Raj Kumar, r/o Ward No. 5, Vill. Punder, P.O. Dain, Tehsil Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.)

2. Smt. Ankita Rani d/o Sh. Jaswant Singh, r/o Ward No.-4, Vill. Jaral, P.O. Ukhil, Tehsil & Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) ..*Applicants*.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Sunil Kumar and Smt. Ankita Rani have filed an application U/S 15 & 16 of Special Marriages Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents before the court of undersigned, stating therein that their marriage ceremony has been performed on 16-01-2026 at Gasota Mahadev Mandir at Gasota, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.) according to Hindu rites and customs.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 06-04-2026. In case no objection is received by 06-04-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 19-03-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-*SDM,*
Sub-Divisional Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HAS, Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur, (H.P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Kishori Lal s/o Sh. Ram Dass, r/o Ward No. 2, Vill. Nahalwin, P.O. Aghar, Tehsil Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.)

2. Smt. Neelma Devi d/o Sh. Larju Ram, r/o Vill. Kaloh, P.O. Bhater, Tehsil Tauni Devi, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) . .*Applicants*.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Kishori Lal and Smt. Neelma Devi have filed an application U/S 15 & 16 of Special Marriages Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents before the court of undersigned, stating therein that their marriage ceremony has been performed on 13-12-2025 at Awahdevi Temple, District Hamirpur (H.P.) according to Hindu rites and customs.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 21-04-2026. In case no objection is received by 21-04-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 19-03-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-*SDM,*
Sub-Divisional Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HAS, Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur, (H.P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sarbjeet Singh s/o Sh. Krishan Chand, r/o Vill. Sahun, P.O. Jalari, Tehsil Nadaun, District Hamirpur (H.P.)

2. Pooja Kumari d/o Sh. Rajinder Kumar, r/o Vill. Muhi, P.O. Kot, Tehsil Tauni Devi, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) ..*Applicants*.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Sarbjeet Singh and Smt. Pooja Kumari have filed an application U/S 5 of Special Marriages Act, 1954 alongwith supporting affidavits and documents before the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within next three calendar months.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 16-04-2026. In case no objection is received by 16-04-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 19-03-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-*SDM,*
Sub-Divisional Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HAS, Marriage Officer-cum-**Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur, (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Manish Sharma s/o Sh. Mauji Ram, r/o Vill. Karahlar, P.O. Office Kuthera, Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.)

2. Shalu Guleria d/o Sh. Jagar Nath Guleria, r/o Vill. Dulehra, P.O. Tehsil & Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) ..*Applicants*.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Manish Sharma and Smt. Shalu Guleria have filed an application U/S 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith supporting affidavits and documents before the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within next three calendar months.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing

before this court on or before 25-04-2026. In case no objection is received by 25-04-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 19-03-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-*SDM,*
Sub-Divisional Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HAS, Marriage Officer-cum-**Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur, (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Parveen Kumar s/o Sh. Beli Ram, r/o Vill. Padal, P.O. Tehsil & District Hamirpur (H.P.)

2. Seema d/o Sh. Raj Thakur, r/o Vill. Ladiyara, P.O. Khayara, Tehsil Dehra, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) . *Applicants*.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Parveen Kumar and Smt. Seema have filed an application U/S 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith supporting affidavits and documents before the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within next three calendar months.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 17-04-2026. In case no objection is received by 17-04-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 19-03-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-*SDM,*
Sub-Divisional Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HAS, Marriage Officer-cum-**Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur, (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Naresh Kumar s/o Sh. Roshan Lal, r/o Vill. Siyuka, P.O. Urei, Tehsil Bharmour, District Chamba (H.P.)

2. Isha d/o Sh. Pankaj Kumar, r/o Vill. Ladyoh, P.O. Town Barara, Tehsil Bamson ast Tauni Devi, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) ..*Applicants*.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Naresh Kumar and Smt. Isha have filed an application U/S 5 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith supporting affidavits and documents before the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within next three calendar months.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 10-04-2026. In case no objection is received by 10-04-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 18-03-2026.

Seal. Sd/-

Marriage Officer-cum-*SDM,*
Sub-Divisional Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HAS, Marriage Officer-cum-**Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur, (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Amit Chaudhary s/o Sh. Lakh Raj, r/o Vill. Jhamrera, P.O. Chamned, Sub-Tehsil Lambloo, District Hamirpur (H.P.)

2. Meenakshi Devi d/o Sh. Kuldeep Kumar, r/o Vill. Khural, P.O. Dhamrol, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.). ..*Applicants*.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Amit Chaudhary and Smt. Meenakshi Devi have filed an application U/S 5 of Special Marriages Act, 1954 alongwith supporting affidavits and documents before the court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within next three calendar months.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing

before this court on or before 25-04-2026. In case no objection is received by 25-04-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 18-03-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-*SDM,*
Sub-Divisional Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sh. Sanjeet Singh, HAS, Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hamirpur, (H.P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Vijay Kumar s/o Sh. Jagdish Chand, r/o Vill. Badoli, P.O. Jhalan, Tehsil Nadaun, District Hamirpur (H.P.)

2. Smt. Urimla Devi d/o Lt. Sh. Rattan Chand, r/o V.P.O. Kirwin, Tehsil & Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.). ..*Applicants*.

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Vijay Kumar and Smt. Urimla Devi have filed an application U/S 15 & 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents before the court of undersigned stating therein that their marriage ceremony has been performed on 17-04-2025 at Santoshi Mata Mandir Kirwin, District Hamirpur (H.P.) according to Hindu rites and customs.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 18-04-2026. In case no objection is received by 18-04-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 19-03-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-*SDM,*
Sub-Divisional Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

कार्यालय उप–पंजीयक तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

श्री सन्दीप शर्मा पुत्र श्री सुग्रीव चन्द शर्मा, निवासी महाल जंगल खोहर, मौजा जलाडी, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––भारतीय पंजीकरण अधिनियिम 1908 की धारा 40 एवं 41 के अन्तर्गत वसीयत के पंजीकरण हेतु सार्वजनिक सूचना।

सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि श्री संजय शर्मा पुत्र स्व0 श्री सुग्रीव चन्द शर्मा निवासी महाल जंगल खोहर मौजा जलाडी तहसील नादौन जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) जिनकी मृत्यु दिनांक 28–10–2025 को हो चुकी है, उनके द्वारा निष्पादित एक वसीयत दिनांक 20–10–2025 को इस कार्यालय में पंजीकरण हेतु प्रस्तुत की गई है। उक्त वसीयत को श्री सन्दीप शर्मा पुत्र स्वर्गीय श्री सुग्रीव चन्द शर्मा, निवासी महाल जंगल खोहर, मौजा जलाडी, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) द्वारा पंजीकरण हेतु पेश किया गया हैं।

यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त वसीयत के पंजीकरण के सम्बंध में कोई आपित्त है, तो वह इस सरकारी गजट / सूचना के प्रकाशन की तिथि 16–04–2026 को अपना या इससे पूर्व एतराज / पक्ष असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत कर सकते है। निर्धारित तिथि समाप्त होने के पश्चात् किसी भी आपत्ति / एतराज पर विचार नहीं किया जाएगाा और यदि कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त नहीं होती है तो भारतीय पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1908 के प्रवधानों के अनुसार वसीयत के पंजीकरण की कार्यवाही पूर्ण कर दी जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 09–03–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
उप–पंजीयक, तहसील नादौन,
जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

––––––––––

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, एवं तहसीलदार नादौन, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती प्रसीनो देवी पुत्री श्री काली दास, महाल चोआ चकराला, डाकघर चोडू, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती प्रसीनो देवी पुत्री श्री काली दास, महाल चोआ चकराला, डाकघर चोडू, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) का आवेदन–पत्र समस्त रिकार्ड व शपथ–पत्र सहित इस कार्यालय में प्राप्त हुआ है प्रसीनो देवी की जन्म तिथि 22–04–1966 को ग्राम पंचायत चोडू के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं करवा सकी। तथा अब वह अपनी उक्त जन्म तिथि 22–04–1966 को सम्बंधित ग्राम पंचायत चोडू में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः इस सरकारी इश्तहार गजट द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्रीमती प्रसीनो देवी पुत्री काली दास की जन्म तिथि 22–04–1966 को ग्राम पंचायत चोडू के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन / वकालतन दिनांक 22–04–2026 को तहसील कार्यालय नादौन जिला हमीरपुर को प्रातः 10.00 बजे उपस्तिथ होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। आम जनता की ओर से

कोई भी उजर / एतराज ना आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेंगी एवं प्रसीनो देवी की जन्म तिथि 22–04–2026 को ग्राम पंचायत चोडू में दर्ज करने के आदेश नियमानुसार पारित कर दिय जायेंगे।

यह इश्तहार मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से आज दिनांक 20–03–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील नादौन,
जिला हमीरपुर, हि0प्र0।

———————

समक्ष नायब तहसीलदार, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

श्री सुदर्शन कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम सिंह, महाल जलाडी सोंखल्या, मौजा जलाडी, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

बनाम

आम जनता

श्री सुदर्शन कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम सिंह, महाल जलाडी सोंखल्या, मौजा जलाडी, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) ने दिनांक 05–02–2026 को इस कार्यालय में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है जिसमें प्रार्थी ने अनुरोंध किया हैं कि प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम कागजात माल महाल जलाडी सोंखल्या, मौजा जलाडी, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में सुदर्शन कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम चन्द दर्ज है परन्तु अन्य जगह जैसा कि आधार कार्ड, परिवार नकल आदि में प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम सुदर्शन कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम सिंह दर्ज है। प्रार्थी का कहना है कि यह दोनों नाम उसके पिता के हैं प्रार्थी अपने पिता का नाम अब दुरुस्त करवाकर कागजात माल महाल जलाडी सोंखल्या, मौजा जलाडी, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में प्रार्थी अपने पिता का नाम सुदर्शन कुमार पुत्र प्रीतम सिंह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस सरकारी गजट द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त प्रार्थी के पिता के नाम को दुरुस्त करवाने में कोई उजर एवं एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख 22–04–2026 को सुबह 10.00 बजे मुकाम तहसील कार्यालय नादौन हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। तारीख पेशी के बाद किसी किस्म का एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी के प्रार्थना–पत्र के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आवश्यक आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

यह इश्तहार मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से आज दिनांक 20–03–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
नायब तहसीलदार,
तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

———————

समक्ष नायब तहसीलदार, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

श्री राजन शर्मा पुत्र सदा राम, महाल लाहड़ कोटलू, मौजा भुम्पल, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

बनाम

आम जनता

श्री राजन शर्मा पुत्र सदा राम, महाल लाहड़ कोटलू, मौजा भुम्पल, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) ने दिनांक 13–03–2026 को इस कार्यालय में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है जिसमें प्रार्थी ने अनुरोध किया हैं कि प्रार्थी अपना नाम कागजात माल महाल लाहड़ कोटलू, मौजा जलाडी, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में राजन पुत्र सदा राम दर्ज है परन्तु अन्य जगह जैसा कि आधार कार्ड, परिवार नकल आदि में प्रार्थी का नाम राजन शर्मा पुत्र सदा राम दर्ज है। प्रार्थी का कहना है कि यह दोनों नाम उसके हैं प्रार्थी अपना नाम अब दुरुस्त करवाकर कागजात माल महाल लाहड़ कोटलू, मौजा भुम्पल, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में प्रार्थी अपना नाम राजन शर्मा पुत्र सदा राम दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस सरकारी गजट द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त प्रार्थी के नाम को दुरुस्त करवाने में कोई उजर एवं एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख 22–04–2026 को सुबह 10.00 बजे मुकाम तहसील कार्यालय नादौन हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। तारीख पेशी के बाद किसी किस्म का एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी के प्रार्थना–पत्र के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आवश्यक आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

यह इश्तहार मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से आज दिनांक 19–03–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
नायब तहसीलदार,
तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

———————

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, एवं नायब तहसीलदार नादौन, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती विमला देवी विधवा पुत्री श्रीधर, निवासी महाल धनपूर, मौजा बड़ा, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती विमला देवी विधवा पुत्री श्रीधर, निवासी महाल धनपूर, मौजा बड़ा, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) का आवेदन–पत्र समस्त रिकार्ड व शपथ–पत्र सहित इस कार्यालय में प्राप्त हुआ है श्रीमती विमला देवी अपने पति श्रीधर पुत्र जमना दास की मृत्यु तिथि 05–01–1959 को ग्राम पंचायत सपड़ोह के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नही करवा सकी, तथा अब वह अपने पति की उक्त मृत्यु तिथि 05–01–1959 को सम्बंधित ग्राम पंचायत सपड़ोह में दर्ज करवाना चाहती हैं।

अतः इस सरकारी इश्तहार गजट द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्रीमती विमला देवी विधवा पुत्री श्रीधर अपने पति श्रीधर पुत्र जमना दास की मृत्यु तिथि 05–01–1959 को ग्राम पंचायत सपड़ोह के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन / वकालतन दिनांक 22–04–2026 को तहसील कार्यालय नादौन जिला हमीरपुर को प्रातः 10.00 बजे उपस्तिथ होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। आम जनता की ओर से कोई भी उजर / एतराज ना आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेंगी एवं श्रीधर पुत्र जमना दास की मृत्यु तिथि 05–01–1959 को ग्राम पंचायत सपड़ोह में दर्ज करने के आदेश नियमानुसार पारित कर दिय जायेंगे।

यह इश्तहार मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से आज दिनांक 19–03–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील नादौन,
जिला हमीरपुर, हि0प्र0।

————————

In the Court of Naib-Tehsildar-cum-**Executive Magistrate, Raja Ka Talab, District Kangra (H.P.)**

File No. /NTEH/2026 Date of Institution : 06-02-2026 Case Titled : Registration of Birth

Krishna Pathania d/o Late Sh. Vakil Singh, r/o Village Manhot, P.O. Larth, Sub-Teshil Raja Ka Talab, District Kangra, H.P.

Versus

General Public

Notice of the General Public

Whereas, Krishna Pathania d/o Late Sh. Vakil Singh, r/o Village Manhot P.O. Larth, Sub-Teshil Raja Ka Talab, District Kangra, H.P. has filed an application before the undersigned that date of Birth of her self is 27-12-1957 but due to ignorance and lack of knowledge it has not been entered in the concenred Gram Panchayat register. She has further stated that she wants to get it registered in Gram Panchayat, Sub-Tehsil Raja Ka Talab.

The applicant has attached non-availability certificate recommendation of Chief Registrar (Birth & Death)-*cum*-Director Health Services Himachal Pradesh Shimla-9. Affidavit of two witnesses namely Shri Sahib Singh s/o Sh. Pratap Singh, r/o Village Manhot, P.O. Larth, Sub-Tehsil Raja Ka Talab, District Kangra, H.P. & Sh. Narinder Singh s/o Late Sh. Vakil Singh, r/o Village Manhot, P.O. Larth, Sub-Tehsil Raja Ka Talab, District Kangra, H.P. have been attached in support of her claim.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of Section 13(3) of the Registration of Birth & Death Act, 1869 a proclamation to all General public concerned is hereby issued that objection in this regard *i.e.* to enter the date of birth of Krishna Pathania d/o Late Sh. Vakil Singh shall be heard by the under signed on 02-04-2026 in his court at Raja Ka Talab. Anyone having any objections in the matter may do so on the said date and place in person or through legal practitioner or his/her recognised agent. In case non-appearance, the proceedings will continue *ex-parte* and necessary action in this matter will be taken accordingly as per law.

Given under my hand and seal of the court on 02-03-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Naib-Tehsildar-cum-*Executive Magistrate,*
Raja Ka Talab, District Kangra (H.P.).

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख पेशी :
29 / RNTK/2026	नाम दुरुस्ती	02–04–2026

बावू राम पुत्र श्री लाल सिंह, निवासी महाल भनियाड़ी, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थी बावू राम ने इस अदालत में अपने पिता के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना–पत्र दिया है क्योंकि राजस्व रिकार्ड महाल भनियाड़ी में लालू दर्ज है, जबकि सही नाम लाल सिंह है। इस बारे प्रार्थी ने बतौर सबूत पर्चा जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2022–23 महाल भनियाड़ी, आधार कार्ड, हल्फिया ब्यान साथ संलग्न की है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इश्तहार से सूचित किया जाता है कि लालू उर्फ लाल सिंह किये जाने बारे यदि किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 02–04–2026 को आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे। इसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 20–03–2026 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर इस अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख पेशी :
28 / RNTK/2026	नाम दुरुस्ती	02–04–2026

सरदार सिंह पुत्र श्री किरपा राम, निवासी गांव जोल, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थी सरदार सिंह ने इस अदालत में अपने पिता के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना–पत्र दिया है क्योंकि राजस्व रिकार्ड महाल जोल में किरपू दर्ज है, जबकि सही नाम किरपा राम है। इस बारे प्रार्थी ने बतौर सबूत पर्चा जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2023–24 महाल जोल, आधार कार्ड, हल्फिया ब्यान साथ संलग्न की है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इश्तहार से सूचित किया जाता है कि किरपू उर्फ किरपा राम किये जाने बारे यदि किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी

की अदालत में दिनांक 02–04–2026 को आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे। इसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 20–03–2026 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर इस अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख पेशी :
35 / RNTK/2026	नाम दुरुस्ती	07–04–2026

प्रेम लाल शर्मा पुत्र श्री मोती राम, निवासी गांव भौन्का, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थी प्रेम लाल शर्मा ने इस अदालत में अपने नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना–पत्र दिया है क्योंकि राजस्व रिकार्ड महाल भौन्का में प्रेम लाल दर्ज है, जबकि सही नाम प्रेम लाल शर्मा है। इस बारे प्रार्थी ने बतौर सबूत पर्चा जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2021–22 महाल भौन्का, आधार कार्ड, परिवार रजिस्टर की प्रति, हल्फिया ब्यान साथ संलग्न की है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इश्तहार से सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रेम लाल उर्फ प्रेम लाल शर्मा किये जाने बारे यदि किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 07–04–2026 को आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे। इसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 20–03–2026 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर इस अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख पेशी :
25 / RNTK/2026	नाम दुरुस्ती	07–04–2026

रविन्दर कुमार पुत्र मुन्शी राम, निवासी महाल जोल, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थी रविन्दर कुमार ने इस अदालत में अपने नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना–पत्र दिया है क्योंकि राजस्व रिकार्ड महाल जोल में रविन्दर सिंह दर्ज है, जबकि सही नाम रविन्दर कुमार है। इस बारे प्रार्थी ने बतौर सबूत पर्चा जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2023–24 महाल जोल, आधार कार्ड, परिवार रजिस्टर की प्रति, हल्फिया ब्यान साथ संलग्न की है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इश्तहार से सूचित किया जाता है कि रविन्दर सिंह उर्फ रविन्दर कुमार किए जाने बारे यदि किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 07–04–2026 को आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे। इसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 20–03–2026 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर इस अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख पेशी :
26 / RNTK/2026	नाम दुरुस्ती	07–04–2026

अनीता कुमारी विधवा श्री महिन्दर सिंह, निवासी गांव अमनी, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थिया अनीता कुमारी ने इस अदालत में अपने पति व बच्चों के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना–पत्र दिया है क्योंकि राजस्व रिकार्ड महाल अमनी में क्रमशः अनमोल पुत्र व कुमारी बर्षा देवी पुत्री श्री महिन्दर सिंह दर्ज है। जबकि सही नाम क्रमशः अनमोल कौशल पुत्र व कुमारी बर्षा कौशल पुत्री श्री मोहिन्दर सिंह है। इस बारे प्रार्थिया ने बतौर सबूत पर्चा जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2024–25 महाल अमनी, आधार कार्ड, परिवार रजिस्टर की प्रति, हल्फिया ब्यान साथ संलग्न की है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इश्तहार से सूचित किया जाता है कि क्रमशः अनमोल उर्फ अनमोल कौशल पुत्र व कुमारी बर्षा देवी उर्फ बर्षा कौशल पुत्री महिन्दर उर्फ श्री मोहिन्दर सिंह किए जाने बारे यदि किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 07–04–2026 को आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे। इसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 20–03–2026 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर इस अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख पेशी :
27 / RNTK/2026	नाम दुरुस्ती	07–04–2026

रचित सोनी पुत्र सतीश कुमार, निवासी महाल तखनियाड़, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थी रचित सोनी ने इस अदालत में अपने नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना–पत्र दिया है क्योंकि राजस्व रिकार्ड महाल तखनियाड़ में गोपी दर्ज है, जबकि सही नाम रचित सोनी है। इस बारे प्रार्थी ने बतौर सबूत पर्चा जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2019–20 महाल तखनियाड़, आधार कार्ड, हल्फिया ब्यान साथ संलग्न की है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इश्तहार से सूचित किया जाता है कि गोपी उर्फ रचित सिंह किए जाने बारे यदि किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 07–04–2026 को आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे। इसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 20–03–2026 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर इस अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख पेशी :
31 / RNTK/2026	नाम दुरुस्ती	16–04–2026

अशीष राणा पुत्र श्री औंकार सिंह पुत्र रतो, निवासी तल्याल, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थी अशीष राणा ने इस अदालत में अपने नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना–पत्र दिया है क्योंकि राजस्व रिकार्ड महाल तल्याल में अशीष सिंह दर्ज है। जबकि सही नाम अशीष राणा है। इस बारे प्रार्थी ने बतौर सबूत पर्चा जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2023–24 महाल तल्याल, आधार कार्ड, हल्फिया ब्यान साथ संलग्न की है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इश्तहार से सूचित किया जाता है कि अशीष सिंह उर्फ अशीष राणा किए जाने बारे यदि किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 06–04–2026 को आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे। इसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 20–03–2026 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर इस अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख पेशी :
32 / RNTK/2026	नाम दुरुस्ती	16–04–2026

पंकज राणा पुत्र श्री जगदीश सिंह पुत्र श्री अडीजंग, निवासी तल्याल, उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थी पंकज राणा ने इस अदालत में अपने पिता के नाम दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना–पत्र दिया है क्योंकि राजस्व रिकार्ड महाल तल्याल में जगदीश चन्द दर्ज है, जबकि सही नाम जगदीश सिंह है। इस बारे प्रार्थी ने बतौर सबूत पर्चा जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2023–24 महाल तल्याल, आधार कार्ड, हल्फिया ब्यान साथ संलग्न की है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को बजरिया इश्तहार से सूचित किया जाता है कि जगदीश चन्द उर्फ जगदीश सिंह किये जाने बारे यदि किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 07–04–2026 को आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे। इसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 20–03–2026 को हस्ताक्षर व मोहर इस अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं नायब तहसीलदार,
उप–तहसील कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

In the Court of Assistant Collector-cum**-Naib Tehsildar, Bharoli, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Rinku Kumar s/o Smt. Guddo Devi alias Raj Kumari d/o Sita Ram, r/o Village Bag, P.O. & Sub-Tehsil Bharoli, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

An Application for the correction of name of Smt. Guddo Devi d/o Sita Ram, as Guddo Devi alias Raj Kumari d/o Sita Ram comprised in khata number 56, Khasra Kita 6, area measuring 0-96-42 hectare situated in vill. Bag P.O. & Sub-Tehsil Bharoli Jamabandi year 2019-20 is submitted by her son Rinku Kumar under section 37(2) of The Land Revenue Act. 1954 alongwith all supporting documents such as Death certificate, Aadhar card, Bank account copy, Parivar register copy and Jamabandi Parcha in the court of undersigned.

Wherein he stated that, His mother belongs to above mentioned address. Her name is written as Guddo Devi d/o Sita Ram in the land/revenue record of Mohal Bag, Mouza Bharoli which is wrong. Whereas her original/correct name is Raj Kumari w/o Amar Singh in her Parivar register copy, death certificate which are attached. Therefore, he has requested to correct her name as Guddo Devi *alias* Raj Kumari d/o Sita Ram instead of Guddo Devi d/o Sita Ram in the revenue record of Mohal Bag, Mouza Bharoli, Sub-Tehsil Bharoli, as per supporting documents enclosed by him with the application file.

Therefore, through this proclamation in gazette, the general public is hereby informed that, if any person having any objection for entry of correction in the name of applicant's mother mentioned above, may submit his/her objection in writing to this court on or before 05-04-2026. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court on dated 05-03-2026.

Seal. Sd/-

Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,
Sub-Tehsil Bharoli, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

In the Court of Assistant Collector 2nd Grade, Jaisinghpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)

Case No : 820441/2026 Date of Hearing : 08-04-2026

1. Chander Bhan s/o Sh. Om Parkash, r/o Ward No. 2, Village Panjlehar, P.O. Kailen, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh.

2. Tamanna Devi d/o Sh. Kamal Singh, r/o Village Maniyara, P.O. Pahra, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, Himachal pradesh. . . *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public, Gram Panchayat Paplah, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh . . *Respondent.*

Subject.—Application under Section 8(4) of the Marriage Registration Act, 1996.

With reference to the above subject, the applicants Chander Bhan s/o Sh. Om Parkash, r/o Ward No. 2, Village Panjlehar, P.O. Kailen, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh and Tamanna Devi d/o Sh. Kamal Singh, r/o Village Maniyara, P.O. Pahra, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh have submitted an application alongwith other documents requesting that their marriage may be registered.

They have stated that their marriage was solemnized on 11-08-2024 according to Hindu customs and traditions in Gram Panchayat Paplah, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh. However, due to lack of awareness, they could not get their marriage registered at that time in Gram Panchayat Paplah. Now the applicants wish to get their marriage registered.

Therefore, through this public notice all concerned persons are informed that if anyone has any objection regarding the registration of marriage dated 11-08-2024 between Chander Bhan and Tamanna Devi, they may appear personally or through a representative before this court and submit their objection on 08-04-2026. If no one appears on the said date, the order for registration will be passed as per rules.

Issued today on 13-03-2026 under my signature and official seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-

Assistant Collector 2nd Grade,
Tehsil Jaisinghpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

In the Court of Dr. Ganesh Thakur, Marriage Officer-cum-**Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

1. Sh. Sonu Kumar s/o Sh. Suresh Kumar, Village Gorda, Tehsil Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)
2. Smt. Jyoti Devi w/o Vijay Kumar, Village Bhanala Khass, P.O. & Tehsil Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) d/o Rania Ram, Village Sanjwan, P.O. Bhogarwan, Tehsil Indora, Distt. Kangra . . *Applicants*.

Versus

1. General Public.
2. Local Registrar, Gram Panchayat Gorda . .*Respondents*.

Subject.—Application for the Marriage Registration u/s 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Applicants Sh. Sonu Kumar s/o Sh. Suresh Kumar, Village Gorda, Tehsil Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) and Smt. Jyoti Devi w/o Vijay Kumar, Village Bhanala Khass, P.O. & Tehsil Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) d/o Rania Ram, Village Sanjwan, P.O. Bhogarwan, Tehsil Indora, Distt. Kangra has filed an application u/s 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith declaration in which they have stated that they have solemnized their marriage on 14-02-2026 at Shri Mata Mansha Devi Mandir Chamunda, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) as per Hindu rites & customs.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding the registration of this marriage can file the objection personally or in

writing before this court on or before 15-04-2026. After that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Seal. Sd/-
(DR. GANESH THAKUR),
Marriage Officer-cum-*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

In the Court of Dr. Ganesh Thakur, Marriage Officer-cum-**Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

1. Sh. Pankaj Kumar s/o Sh. Chaman Lal, Village Gaggal, Tehsil Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)
2. Smt. Pallavi Koundal d/o Pardeep Kumar, Village Purtiala, P.O. Kohala, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) . . *Applicants*.

Versus

1. General Public.
2. Local Registrar, Gram Panchayat Makroti. . .*Respondents*.

Subject.—Application for the Marriage Registration u/s 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Applicants Sh. Pankaj Kumar s/o Sh. Chaman Lal, Village Gaggal, Tehsil Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) and Smt. Pallavi Koundal d/o Pardeep Kumar, Village Purtiala, P.O. Kohala, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) has filed an application u/s 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith declaration in which they stated that they have solemnized their marriage on 31-10-2025 at Village Gaggal, Tehsil Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) as per Hindu rites & customs.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding the registration of this marriage can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 18-04-2026. After that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Seal. Sd/-
(DR. GANESH THAKUR),
Marriage Officer-cum-*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

In the Court of Dr. Ganesh Thakur, Marriage Officer-cum-**Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

1. Sh. Kikar Singh s/o Sh. Kartar Singh, Village Bhatechh, P.O. Tharu, Tehsil Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)
2. Smt. Manjit Kaur d/o Bahadur Singh, V.P.O. Tand Kasel, Tehsil & Distt. Amritsar, Punjab. . . *Applicants*.

Versus

1. General Public.
2. Local Registrar, Gram Panchayat Tharu. . .*Respondents*.

Subject.—Application for the Marriage Registration u/s 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Applicants Sh. Kikar Singh s/o Sh. Kartar Singh Village Bhatechh, P.O. Tharu, Tehsil Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) and Smt. Manjit Kaur d/o Bahadur Singh, V.P.O. Tand Kasel, Tehsil & Distt. Amritsar, Punjab has filed an application u/s 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith declaration in which they have stated that they solemnized their marriage on 13-04-2025 at V.P.O. Tand Kasel, Tehsil & Distt. Amritsar, Punjab as per Hindu rites & customs.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding the registration of this marriage can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 18-04-2026. After that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Seal.

Sd/-
(DR. GANESH THAKUR),
Marriage Officer-cum-*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
Shahpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, खुण्ड़ियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख पेशी :
709656 / 2026	जन्म पंजीकरण	21—04—2026

सुनील कुमार पुत्र कपूर सिंह, निवासी गांव अम्वाडा, डाकघर व तहसील खुण्ड़ियां, ग्राम पंचायत खुण्ड़िया, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)। . प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता . .प्रतिवादी।

विषय.—— जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969 की धारा 13(3) के तहत जन्म पंजीकरण हेत प्रार्थना—पत्र।

प्रार्थी सुनील कुमार पुत्र कपूर सिंह निवासी गांव अम्वाडा, डाकघर व तहसील खुण्ड़ियां, ग्राम पंचायत खुण्ड़ियां, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 ने इस अदालत में असालतन हाजिर होकर प्रार्थना—पत्र मय व्यान हल्फी पेश करते हुए आवेदन किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 04—09—1979 को गांव अम्वाडा डाकघर व तहसील खुण्ड़ियां ग्राम पंचायत खुण्ड़ियां जिला कांगड़ा हि0प्र0 में हुआ है। परन्तु अज्ञानतावंश उसका जन्म का पंजीकण स्थानीय ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज न करवाया गया है। अतः प्रार्थी इस न्यायालय के माध्यम से अपने जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश ग्राम पंचायत खुण्ड़ियां को जारी करवाना चाहता है।

अतः प्रार्थी का आवेदन स्वीकार करते हुए इस इश्तहार मुस्त्री मुनादी द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति या संस्था को उपरोक्त की जन्म तिथि 04—09—1979 के पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 21—04—2026 को हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकता है बाद तारीख पेशी किस्मका कोई उजर / एतराज नहीं सुना जावेगा व उपरोक्त श्री सुनील कुमार पुत्र श्री कपूर सिंह की जन्म तिथि को पंजीकृत करने के आदेश उप—स्थानीय पंजीकार जन्म व मृत्यु ग्राम पंचायत खुण्ड़ियां को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 23–03–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
खुण्ड़ियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, खुण्ड़ियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख पेशी :
709655 / 2026	जन्म पंजीकरण	21–04–2026

श्रीमती समना देवी पुत्री श्री कपूर सिंह, निवासी गांव अम्वाडा, डाकघर व तहसील खुण्ड़िया, ग्राम पंचायत खुण्ड़िया, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)। प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता ..प्रतिवादी।

विषय.–– जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(3) के तहत जन्म पंजीकरण हेतु प्रार्थना–पत्र।

प्रार्थिया समना देवी पुत्री श्री कपूर सिंह, निवासी गांव अम्वाडा, डाकघर व तहसील खुण्ड़िया, ग्राम पंचायत खुण्ड़िया, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 ने इस अदालत में असालतन हाजिर होकर प्रार्थना–पत्र मय ब्यान हल्फी पेश करते हुए आवेदन किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 14–11–1976 को गांव अम्वाडा डाकघर व तहसील खुण्ड़ियां ग्राम पंचायत खुण्ड़िया जिला कांगड़ा हि0प्र0 में हुआ है। परन्तु अज्ञानतावंश उसका जन्म का पंजीकण स्थानीय ग्राम पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज न करवाया गया है। अतः प्रार्थिया इस न्यायालय के माध्यम से अपने जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश ग्राम पंचायत खुण्ड़ियां को जारी करवाना चाहती है।

अतः प्रार्थिया का आवेदन स्वीकार करते हुए इस इश्तहार मुश्त्री मुनादी द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति या संस्था को उपरोक्त की जन्म तिथि 14–11–1976 के पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 21–04–2026 को हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकता है बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किस्म का कोई उजर / एतराज नहीं सुना जावेगा व उपरोक्त श्रीमती समना देवी पुत्री श्री कपूर सिंह की जन्म तिथि को पंजीकृत करने के आदेश उप स्थानीय पंजीकार जन्म व मृत्यु ग्राम पंचायत खुण्ड़ियां को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 23–03–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
खुण्ड़ियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

Before the Rahul Sharma, Executive Magistrate-cum-Naib Tehsildar, Sub-Tehsil Pangna, District Mandi (H.P.)

File No. 47/2026 Date of institution: 16-03-2026

In the matter of:

1. Manish Kumar s/o Late Sh. Prem Raj *alias* Prem Lal, r/o Village Shana, P.O. Pangna Sub-Tehsil Pangna, District Mandi (H.P.).

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Proclamation Notice for the registration of death under section 13(3) of the registration of birth & death Act, 1969.

The present case file of the above mentioned applicant is received in this office through the worthy district Registrar (birth & death)-*cum*-Chief Medical Officer Mandi, District Mandi (H.P.) *vide* their office letter No. HFW-MND (Delayed Birth & Death) 2026-1049, dated 20th January, 2026.

And whereas, the applicant has stated that his father, Late Shri Prem Raj *alias* Prem Lal, son of Shri Ghanshyam, expired on 31-12-1989 at Pangna, but the said death has not been recorded in the death Register of Gram Panchayat Pangna, Development Block Churag till date. The applicant has requested for registration of the said death in the office Death Registrar under Section 13(3) of the Registration of birth & death Act, 1969.

Therefore, the general public of Gram Panchayat Pangna, Development Block Churag is hereby informed through this notice that if any person has any objection regarding registration of this death can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 16-04-2026 at 10.00 AM. The objection received after 16-04-2026 will not be entertained and the death will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 16th day of April, 2026 under my hand and seal.

Seal. Sd/-
Executive Magistrate-cum-*Naib Tehsildar.*
Sub-Tehsil Pangna, District Mandi (H.P).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Smt. Nisha Kumari w/o Sh. Sohan Singh, r/o Village & P.O. Majhewali, Tehsil Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh. . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of her son name from "SHORYA s/o SOHAN SINGH" to "SHOURYA s/o SOHAN SINGH" in the records of the Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the applicant.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding change of applicant son name as "SHOURYA s/o SOHAN SINGH" in place of "SHORYA s/o SOHAN SINGH", they should appear before the undersigned on or before 10-04-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued today on 11th day of the March, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
(HARSH AMRENDER SINGH, HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Hira Lal s/o Sh. Jia Lal, r/o Village Kapti, P.O. Dhargaura, Tehsil Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh. . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of his son name from "NIRBHAY AMBEDKARVADI VERMA s/o HIRA LAL" to "NIRBHAY VERMA s/o HIRA LAL" in the records of the Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the applicant.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding change of applicant son name as"NIRBHAY VERMA s/o HIRA LAL" in place of "NIRBHAY AMBEDKARVADI VERMA s/o HIRA LAL", they should appear before the undersigned on or before 17-04-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued today on 18th day of the March, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
(HARSH AMRENDER SINGH, HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Sh. Surjeet Singh s/o Sh. Shiv Lal, r/o Village Thala, P.O. Munish bahli, Tehsil Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh. . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of his daughter's name from "TAMANNA d/o SURJEET SINGH" to "TAMNA d/o SURJEET SINGH" in the records of the Aadhar card and all other relevant documents associated with the applicant.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding change of applicant daughter's name as "TAMNA d/o SURJEET SINGH" in place of "TAMANNA d/o SURJEET SINGH", they should appear before the undersigned on or before 16-04-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued today on 17th day of the March, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
(HARSH AMRENDER SINGH, HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Natasha d/o Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Village & P.O. Kinnu, Tehsil Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh. . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of her name from "NITASHA d/o ISHWAR DASS" to "NATASHA d/o ISHWAR DASS" in the records of the Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the applicant.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding change of applicant name as "NATASHA d/o ISHWAR DASS" in place of "NITASHA d/o ISHWAR DASS", they should appear before the undersigned on or before 17-04-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued today on 18th day of the March, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
(HARSH AMRENDER SINGH, HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Sh. Yashpal s/o Sh. Mohan Lal, r/o Village & P.O. Thaili Chakti, Tehsil Nankhari, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh. . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of is daughter name from "PRIJAYL SHARMA d/o YASHPAL" to "PRIJAL d/o YASHPAL" in the records of the Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the applicant.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding change of applicant daughter name as "PRIJAL d/o YASHPAL" in place of "PRIJAYL SHARMA d/o YASHPAL", they should appear before the undersigned on or before 16-04-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued today on 17th day of the March, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
(HARSH AMRENDER SINGH, HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Neeta Devi d/o Sh. Bidhi Chand, r/o Village & P.O. Jeori, Tehsil Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh. . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of her name from "ANITA SHARMA d/o BIDHI CHAND" to "NEETA DEVI d/o BIDHI CHAND" in the records of the Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the applicant.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding change of applicant name as "NEETA DEVI d/o BIDHI CHAND" in place of "ANITA SHARMA d/o BIDHI CHAND", they should appear before the undersigned on or before 16-04-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued today on 17th day of the March, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
(HARSH AMRENDER SINGH, HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Smt. Usha Devi W/o Sh. Kuldeep, r/o Village Funja P.O. Majhewali, Tehsil Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh. . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of her daughter's name from "JASLEEN SINGH " to "JASIKA" in the records of the Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the applicant.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to change her daughter name as "JASIKA d/o KULDEEP SINGH" in place of "JASLEEN SINGH d/o KULDEEP SINGH", they should appear before the undersigned on or before 24-04-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader. In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard, and name will be recorded accordingly.

Issued today on 25th day of the March, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal. Sd/-
(HARSH AMRENDER SINGH, HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Smt. Gautam Singh Mehta s/o Sh. Beli Ram, r/o Village Naini P.O. Badhal, Tehsil Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh. . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of his name from "GAUTAM SINGH " to "GAUTAM SINGH MEHTA" in the records of the Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the applicant.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to change his name as S"GAUTAM SINGH MEHTA s/o BELI RAM" in place of "GAUTAM SINGH s/o BELI RAM", they should appear before the undersigned on or before 24-04-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader. In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard, and name will be recorded accordingly.

Issued today on 25th day of the March, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal.

Sd/-
(HARSH AMRENDER SINGH, HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

ब अदालत श्री प्रेम सिंह, कार्यकरी दण्डाधिकारी सराहन, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)

नं0 मुकद्दमा : 1 / 2026 तारीख दायर : 02–03–2026 अगली सुनवाई : 15–04–2026

श्रीमती शान्ती देवी पुत्री श्री सनम देव, गांव कठमी, डाकघर बौंडा हालाबाद पत्नी निवासी गांव धराली, डा0 ज्यूरी, उप–तहसील सराहन, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) .. वादिया।

बनाम

आम जनता .. प्रतिवादी।

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र बाबत ग्राम पंचायत सराहन मे जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारे।

श्रीमती शान्ती देवी पुत्री श्री सनम देव, गांव कठमी, डाकघर बौंडा हालाबाद पत्नी श्री मंगल सैन निवासी गांव धराली, डा0 ज्यूरी, उप–तहसील सराहन, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) ने इस कार्यालय में अपनी जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत सराहन में दर्ज करवाने बारे आवेदन पत्र व ब्यान हल्फी दिया है। प्रार्थी ने आवेदन किया कि अपनी जन्म तिथि का पंजीकरण पंचायत अभिलेख सराहन में दर्ज न हो सका। प्रर्थिया का जन्म तिथि निम्न प्रकार हैः–

क्रम सं0	प्रार्थिया का नाम	तारीख जन्म
1.	श्रीमती शान्ती देवी पुत्री श्री सनम देव	01–7–1959

अतः आम जनता को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख में प्रार्थी की जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारे किसी भी व्यक्ति का किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 16–04–2026 को प्रातः 11.00 बजें असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना उजर व एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 19–03–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
(प्रेम सिंह),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
उप–तहसील सराहन, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

———————

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate Kumarsain, District Shimla H.P.

1. Shri Manoj Kumar s/o Sh. Bhup Ram, r/o Village Dagrot, P.O. Kotighat, Tehsil Kumarsain, District Shimla (H.P.)

2. Ms. Nikita Sharma d/o Sh. Rajinder Prashad Sharma, r/o V.P.O. Mehatpur, Tehsil & District Una (H.P.) . .Applicant.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Registration of Marriage under the H.P. Registration of Marriades Act, 1996.

Whreras, the above named applicants have made an application of Marriage Act, 1996 alongwith an affidavits stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on 09-08-2014 at Una Ditrict Una, H.P. but this marriage has not been entered in the records of the Registrar of Marriages-cum-Panchayat Kotighat, District Shimla H.P. and whereas, the applicants have prayed that necessary order for the registration of their marriage.

Now, therefour, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding the registration of the marriage of the above named applicants, they should appear before the court of undersigned within 30 days from the publication of the notice, either personally or through their authorized agent.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there is no objection to the proposed registration of marriage and orders shall be passed *ex-parte* for the registration of marriage without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued under my hand seal of the court on this 18th March, 2026.

Seal. (MUKESH SHARMA), HAS,
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Kumarsain, District Shimla (H.P).

In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum-**Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shimla (Rural), District Shimla (H.P.)**

1 Sh. Nishant Sahani s/o Late Sh. Sansar Chand Sahani, r/o Kamla Niwas, Near Tunnel Dhalli, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh age 32 years.

2. Ms. Avantika Handa d/o Sh. Anil Kumar Handa, r/o House No. 1272A, Ward No. 4, Gupt Ganga Road, Pushp Vihar Colony, Kangra, Tehsil & District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh age 28 years.

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Registration of Marriage under the H.P. Registration of Marriage Act, 1996.

Sh. Nishant Sahani s/o Late Sh. Sansar Chand Sahani, r/o Kamla Niwas, Near Tunnel Dhalli, Tehsil & District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh and Ms. Avantika Handa d/o Sh. Anil Kumar Handa, r/o House No. 1272A, Ward No. 4, Gupt Ganga Road, Pushp Vihar Colony, Kangra, Tehsil & District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of the undersigned stating therein that they have solemnized their marriage on 12-10-2024 and are living together as husband and wife since then, but the marriage has not been found entered in the records of Registrar of Marriages of Gram Panchayat concerned/Municipal Corporation Shimla.

Therefore, objections are hereby invited from the General Public through this notice, that if anyone has any objection regarding registration of this marriage, then they can file their objections personally or in writing before this court of undersigned on or before one month of publication of this notice. After that no objection shall be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court today on 20-03-2026.

Seal.

Sd/-
Additional District Registrar of Marriages-cum-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shimla (Rural).

ब अदालत नायब तहसीलदार कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील एवं जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)

केस नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख दायर :	तारीख पेशी :
04 / Mar /2026	विवाह पंजीकरण	29—07—2026	22—04—2026

1. मुनीश कुमार पुत्र बलवंत सिंह, निवासी धमांदरी, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)।

2. श्रीमती बबिता पुत्री राजिन्द्र, निवासी बिहार कॉलोनी सिखेरा, मीरूट केंट, उत्तर प्रदेश।

बनाम

आम जनता

"मुस्त्री मुनादी" व चस्पांगी"।

विषय.–प्रार्थना–पत्र शादी पंजीकरण प्रार्थी मुनीश कुमार पुत्र बलवंत सिंह, निवासी धमांदरी, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0) बाबत दिए जाने आदेश रजिस्ट्रेशन ग्राम पंचायत धमांदरी, को शादी दर्ज करने बारे।

प्रार्थना–पत्र शादी पंजीकरण प्रार्थी मुनीश कुमार पुत्र बलवंत सिंह, निवासी धमांदरी, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र दायर किया है कि उनकी शादी हिन्दू रीति–रिवाज के अनुसार दिनांक 12–12–2023 को श्रीमती बबिता पुत्री राजिन्द्र, निवासी बिहार कॉलोनी सिखेरा, मीरूट केंट, उत्तर प्रदेश से हुई है परन्तु यह शादी सहबन गलती से "ग्राम पंचायत धमांदरी" के रजिस्टर में दर्ज न करवाई गई है, उन्होंने इस शादी को "ग्राम पंचायत धमांदरी" में दर्ज करने के लिए अनुरोध किया है। प्रार्थी ने अपनी शादी की पुष्टि में आधार कार्ड, शपथ–पत्र तथा अन्य दस्तावेज प्रार्थना–पत्र के साथ दायर करके आवेदन किया है।

अतः मुस्त्री मुनादी व चस्पांगी के माध्यम से आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी को उपरोक्त विवाह पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 22–04–2026 को सुबह 10 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी अतः उपरोक्त विवाह पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिए जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई उजर / एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 23–03–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील ऊना, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील एवं जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)

केस नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	तारीख दायर :	तारीख पेशी :
05 / Mar /2026	विवाह पंजीकरण	23–02–2026	22–04–2026

1. बलराम सिंह पुत्र सोहन सिंह, निवासी मदनपुर, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)।

2. श्रीमती सुषमा देवी पुत्री गुरदियाल सिंह, निवासी लसाडा गढ़शंकर, जिला होशियारपुर पंजाब।

बनाम

आम जनता

"मुस्त्री मुनादी" व चस्पांगी"।

विषय.–प्रार्थना–पत्र शादी पंजीकरण प्रार्थी बलराम सिंह पुत्र सोहन सिंह, निवासी मदनपुर, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0) बाबत दिए जाने आदेश रजिस्ट्रेशन ग्राम पंचायत मदनपुर, को शादी दर्ज करने बारे।

प्रार्थना–पत्र शादी पंजीकरण प्रार्थी बलराम सिंह पुत्र सोहन सिंह, निवासी मदनपुर, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र दायर किया है कि उनकी शादी हिन्दू रीति–रिवाज के अनुसार दिनांक 11–10–1991 को श्रीमती सुषमा देवी पुत्री गुरदियाल सिंह, निवासी लसाडा गढ़शंकर, जिला

होशियारपुर, पंजाब से हुई है परन्तु यह शादी सहबन गलती से "ग्राम पंचायत मदनपुर" के रजिस्टर में दर्ज न करवाई गई है, उन्होंने इस शादी को "ग्राम पंचायत मदनपुर" में दर्ज करने के लिए अनुरोध किया है। प्रार्थी ने अपनी शादी की पुष्टि में आधार कार्ड, शपथ–पत्र तथा अन्य दस्तावेज प्रार्थना–पत्र के साथ दायर करके आवेदन किया है।

अतः मुस्त्री मुनादी व चस्पांगी के माध्यम से आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी को उपरोक्त विवाह पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 22–04–2026 को सुबह 10 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी अतः उपरोक्त विवाह पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिए जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 23–03–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/–
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील ऊना, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत कार्याकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)

केस नं0 :	किस्म मुकद्दमाः	तारीख पेशीः
04/Birth/ /2026	जन्म पंजीकरण	22–04–2026

1. श्रीमती निर्मला देवी पुत्री श्री हरी राम, निवासी वार्ड नं0 04, नियर शिव मंदिर, चंदर लोक कॉलोनी, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हि0प्र0। प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता प्रत्यार्थी।

''इश्तहार राजपत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश/मुश्त्री मुनादी व चस्पानगी''।

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र जन्म पंजीकरण प्रार्थिया श्रीमती निर्मला देवी पुत्री श्री हरी राम, निवासी वार्ड नं0 04, नियर शिव मंदिर, चंदर लोक कॉलोनी, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हि0प्र0 बाबत दिए जाने आदेश रजिस्ट्रेशन जन्म पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत मलाहत, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हि0प्र0।

प्रार्थना–पत्र जन्म पंजीकरण प्रार्थिया श्री श्रीमती निर्मला देवी पुत्री श्री हरी राम, निवासी वार्ड नं0 04, नियर शिव मंदिर चंदर लोक कॉलोनी, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हि0प्र0 ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र दायर किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 06–06–1966 को गांव मलाहत में हुआ था। परन्तु यह जन्म पंजीकरण अनभिज्ञता के कारण ग्राम पंचायत मलाहत के रजिस्टर में दर्ज न हो सका।

अतः ''इश्तहार राजपत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश/मुश्त्री मुनादी व चस्पांनगी'' द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक तारीख पेशी 22–04–2026 सुबह 10.00 बजे से लेकर शाम 5.00 बजे तक इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन अपना एतराज अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर ग्राम पंचायत मलाहत को उक्त पंजीकरण करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई उजर/एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 23–03–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता दितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील ऊना, जिला ऊना (हि0प्र0)।

———————

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Saroja Devi w/o Sh. Rakesh Kumar, r/o Village Roso, P.O. Sadoht, Sub-Tehsil Tihara, Teh Dharampur, District Mandi (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Saroj to Saroja Devi. I shall be known as Saroja Devi for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

SAROJA DEVI
w/o Sh. Rakesh Kumar,
r/o Village Roso, P.O. Sadoht, Sub-Tehsil Tihara,
Teh Dharampur, District Mandi (H.P.).

———————

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sikandar Singh s/o Sh. Gian Singh, r/o Village Thali, P.O. & Sub-Tehsil Jangla, District Shimla (H.P.) Pin code-171 214 declare that I have changed my daughter's name from Baby Two of Binta (Old Name) to Ahana (New Name). All concerned please note.

SIKANDAR SINGH
s/o Sh. Gian Singh,
r/o Village Thali, P.O. & Sub-Tehsil Jangla,
District Shimla (H.P.) Pin code-171 214.

———————

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Pawan Kumar s/o Sh. Mahender, r/o Village Denwari, P.O. Khabal, Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.)-171 208 declare that I have changed my son's name from Akush (Old Name) to Aksh Kumar (New Name). All concerned please may note.

PAWAN KUMAR
s/o Sh. Mahender,
r/o Village Denwari, P.O. Khabal,
Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.)-171 208.

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Jagdish Bhat employed as Deputy Commandent (GD) at SSB Training Center Sarahan, Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla (H.P.) declare that Jagdish Bhat and Jagdist Ram both are one and the same person and in future known me only Jagdish Bhat for all purposes. All concerned please may note.

JAGDISH BHAT
r/o SSB Training Center Sarahan,
Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Lobzang Tanzin s/o Late Sh. Karjuit, r/o Village Tailing, P.O. Mudh, Tehsil Spiti, District Lahaul & Spiti (H.P.)-172 117 declare that in my daughter's Aadhar Card, her name is wrongly entered as Baby Three of Sonam Yangchen, which should be corrected as Furbu Dolma. Please correct this.

LOBZANG TANZIN
s/o Late Sh. Karjuit,
r/o Village Tailing, P.O. Mudh, Tehsil Spiti,
District Lahaul & Spiti (H.P.)-172 117.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Paramjeet Kaur w/o Sh. Parvinder Singh, r/o House No. 61/13, Mohalla Govindgarh, Nahan, District Sirmaur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my daughter's name from Asisdeep Kaur to Ashishdeep Kaur, in Aadhar Card No. 8517 3059 2995. All concerned please note.

PARAMJEET KAUR
w/o Sh. Parvinder Singh,
r/o House No. 61/13, Mohalla Govindgarh,
Nahan, District Sirmaur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Himanshi d/o Sh. Jitender Kumar, r/o Village Banikhet, P.O. Banikhet, Tehsil Dalhousie, District Chamba (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Himanshi to Himanshi Sharma. Henceforth I shall be known as Himanshi Sharma.

HIMANSHI
d/o Sh. Jitender Kumar,
r/o Village Banikhet, P.O. Banikhet,
Tehsil Dalhousie, District Chamba (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Surjeet Kamal w/o Sh. Rajinder Kumar Koundal, r/o Village Bhiura, P.O. Kummi, Tehsil Balh, Kumi (230), District Mandi (H.P.) declare that my correct name is Surjeet Kamal and wrongly recorded in my Aadhar Card No. 5772 2529 8809 as Sarjeet Kamal. All concerned note it.

SURJEET KAMAL
w/o Sh. Rajinder Kumar Koundal,
r/o Village Bhiura, P.O. Kummi, Tehsil Balh,
Kumi (230), District Mandi (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sagati w/o Sh. Pyare Lal, r/o Village Haunchali, P.O. Gaonsari, Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.) declare that my name is wrongly mentioned as Sagar Mani in my Aadhar Card No. 3718 7973 9678. Therefore it should be changed to Sagati in my Aadhar Card. All concerned please may note.

SAGATI
w/o Sh. Pyare Lal,
r/o Village Haunchali, P.O. Gaonsari,
Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Meera Devi w/o Sh. Jaya Singh, r/o P.O. Sadyana, Tehsil Sadar, Bhatwar, District Mandi (H.P.) declare that my correct name is Meera Devi and wrongly recorded in my Aadhar Card No. 2574 8011 7192 as Neera Devi. All concerned please note.

MEERA DEVI
w/o Sh. Jaya Singh,
r/o P.O. Sadyana, Tehsil Sadar,Bhatwar,
District Mandi (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Panma Dorje s/o Sh. Chhewang Tomdan, r/o Tehsil Spiti, Tabo (174/1), Tabo, Lahaul & Spiti (H.P.) declare that my correct name is Panma Dorje and wrongly recorded in my Aadhar Card No. 4154 6464 9717 as Padma Dorje. All concerned please note.

PANMA DORJE
s/o Sh. Chhewang Tomdan,
r/o Tehsil Spiti, Tabo (174/1), Tabo, Lahaul & Spiti (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sonu w/o Sh. Dalip Singh, r/o Village Bajeshal, P.O. Khadrala, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) declare that I have changed my daughter's name from Baby One of Sonu (Old Name) to Eva (New Name). All concerned please may note.

SONU
w/o Sh. Dalip Singh,
r/o Village Bajeshal, P.O. Khadrala,
Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Ranjeet Singh s/o Sh. Fagnu, r/o Thach, Tehsil Thunag, VTC: D.P.F. Bagra (692), P.O. Khunachi, Distt. Mandi (H.P.) declare that I wants to change my name from Jeet Singh to Ranjeet Singh in Aadhar Card No. 7891 0690 8370. All concerned please note.

RANJEET SINGH
s/o Sh. Fagnu,
r/o Thach, Tehsil Thunag, VTC: D.P.F. Bagra (692),
P.O. Khunachi, Distt. Mandi (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Dina Nath s/o Sh. Udho Singh, r/o Ward No. 3, Village Laloh, P.O. Tikri, Tehsil Sihunta, Distt. Chamba (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Dino Kumar to Dina Nath. I shall be known as Dina Nath for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

DINA NATH
s/o Sh. Udho Singh,
r/o Ward No. 3, Village Laloh, P.O. Tikri,
Tehsil Sihunta, Distt. Chamba (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Mustfaa s/o Sh. Hasan, r/o Village Dhakiyada, P.O. Bhanjradu, Tehsil Churah, Distt. Chamba (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor daughter's name from Dharee to Dharo. She shall be known as Dharo for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

MUSTFAA
s/o Sh. Hasan,
r/o Village Dhakiyada, P.O. Bhanjradu,
Tehsil Churah, Distt. Chamba (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sulochana Devi widow of Sh. Prakam Chand, r/o Village & P.O. Kothi, Tehsil Baijnath, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)-176 088 declare that I have changed my name in Aadhar Card No. 5074 1524 0656 from Salochna Devi to Sulochana Devi. Whereas my correct name is Sulochana Devi. All concerned please may note.

SULOCHANA DEVI
widow of Sh. Prakam Chand,
r/o Village & P.O. Kothi,
Tehsil Baijnath, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)-176 088.

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Rajkumar Thakur employed as Assistant Commandant (GD) at SSB Training Center Sarahan, Tehsil Rampur, Distt. Shimla (H.P.) declare that Rajkumar Thakur and Raj Kumar both are one and the same person and in future known me only as Rajkumar Thakur. All concerned please may note.

RAJKUMAR THAKUR
c/o SSB Training Center Sarahan,
Tehsil Rampur, Distt. Shimla (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Pankaj Sharma s/o Sh. Prem Lal Sharma, r/o Sharma Niwas, Village Janog, P.O. Ghanahatti, Tehsil & Distt. Shimla (H.P.) declare that my son who was born in KNH Shimla, his birth certificate name is wrongly entered as Devansh Sharma, which should be corrected as Darsh Sharma. Please correct this.

PANKAJ SHARMA
s/o Sh. Prem Lal Sharma,
r/o Sharma Niwas, Village Janog, P.O. Ghanahatti,
Tehsil & Distt. Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Surinder Singh s/o Sh. Milap Singh, r/o Malal, P.O. Bhogarwan, Tehsil Indora, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) declare that I have changed my daughter's name from Mehak to Mehak Ranaut for all intents & purposes.

SURINDER SINGH
s/o Sh. Milap Singh,
r/o Malal, P.O. Bhogarwan,
Tehsil Indora, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Sarvesh Singh Bisht s/o Late Sh. Puran Singh Bisht, r/o V.P.O. Dari, Tehsil Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) declare that in my Service Documents, my name is wrongly entered as Sarvesh Bisht. Whereas, my correct name is Sarvesh Singh Bisht. I shall be known as Sarvesh Singh Bisht for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

SARVESH SINGH BISHT
s/o Late Sh. Puran Singh Bisht,
r/o V.P.O. Dari,
Tehsil Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Vijay Kumari w/o Late Sh. Somnath, r/o Village Ankawali, Tehsil Baddi, Distt. Solan (H.P.) declare that Sunita Devi and Vijay Kumari both are my names and in future I will be known as Sunita Devi. All concerned please note.

.

VIJAY KUMARI
w/o Late Sh. Somnath,
r/o Village Ankawali,
Tehsil Baddi, Distt. Solan (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Suman Rani w/o Sh. Ashok Kumar, r/o V.P.O. Thana Darogan, Tehsil Bamson at Tauni Devi, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Sumna Rani to Suman Rani. I shall be known as Suman Rani for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

SUMAN RANI
w/o Sh. Ashok Kumar,
r/o V.P.O. Thana Darogan,
Tehsil Bamson at Tauni Devi, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Jasoda w/o Late Sh. Megha Ram, r/o Village Bagwara, P.O. Bagwara, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Yashoda Devi to Jasoda for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

JASODA
w/o Late Sh. Megha Ram,
r/o Village Bagwara, P.O. Bagwara,
Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Suresh Kumar s/o Sh. Roop Lal, r/o Village Jangal, P.O. Tikker, Tehsil Sarkaghat, Distt. Mandi (H.P.)-175 049 declare that in my Aadhar Card No. 4009 6841 7049, my name is wrongly entered as Suresh Kumar, which is incorrect. Whereas, my correct name is Suresh Kumar Jamwal. Which may be amended accordingly.

SURESH KUMAR
s/o Sh. Roop Lal,
r/o Village Jangal, P.O. Tikker,
Tehsil Sarkaghat, Distt. Mandi (H.P.)-175 049.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Praveen Kumar s/o Sh. Sunder Lal, r/o Village Hanstari, P.O. Samra, Tehsil Tikkar, Distt. Shimla (H.P.) declare that name of my son Divyansh Chauhan is wrongly mentioned as "Baby of Monika" in his Aadhar Card No. 9618 5355 1901. Therefore, it should be changed to Divyansh Chauhan in his Aadhar Card. All concerned please may note.

PRAVEEN KUMAR
s/o Sh. Sunder Lal,
r/o Village Hanstari, P.O. Samra,
Tehsil Tikkar, Distt. Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Jaymanti w/o Late Sh. Basti Ram, r/o Village Kakog (107), P.O. Rajana, Tehsil Renukaji, District Sirmaur (H.P.) declare that my correct and actual name as per my documents is Jamanti. However, my name is incorrectly shown as Manti Devi in my Aadhar Card No. 7011 5668 8458 this is wrong and should be corrected as Jaymanti in my Aadhar Card. All concerned please may note.

JAYMANTI
w/o Late Sh. Basti Ram,
r/o Village Kakog (107), P.O. Rajana,
Tehsil Renukaji, District Sirmaur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Lacchmi Devi w/o Late Sh. Devi Ram, r/o Village Bhalar, P.O. Bhalona, Sub-Tehsil Haripurdhar, District Sirmaur (H.P.) declare that as per documents, including Bonafide Himachali and revenue records, my actual and correct name is Lacchmi Devi. However in my Aadhar Card No. 3330 8199 8928, my name has been incorrectly recorded as Laxmi Devi, which is wrong. Furthermore, my husband's name has also been incorrectly mentioned as Bhadar Singh instead of Devi Ram in my Aadhar Card, which is not correct as per my official records. Therefore, it is necessary to correct the records the records to reflect my correct details as Lacchmi Devi w/o Late Devi Ram. All concerned please may note.

LACCHMI DEVI
w/o Late Sh. Devi Ram,
r/o Village Bhalar, P.O. Bhalona,
Sub-Tehsil Haripurdhar, District Sirmaur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Bhawani Bhardwaj s/o Sh. Om Chand, r/o Village Dolan, P.O. Brang, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Raj Kumar to Bhawani Bhardwaj, I shall be known as Bhawani Bhardwaj for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

BHAWANI BHARDWAJ
s/o Sh. Om Chand,
r/o Village Dolan, P.O. Brang,
Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Madina w/o Sh. Piyar Mohammad, r/o Village Dhand, P.O. Kalhel, Tehsil Churah, District Chamba (H.P.) declare that in my Aadhar Card bearing No. 8176 3390 8108 my name is wrongly entered as Madino. Whereas my correct name is Madina. I shall be known as Madina for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

MADINA
w/o Sh. Piyar Mohammad,
r/o Village Dhand, P.O. Kalhel,
Tehsil Churah, District Chamba (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Meenu Kumari Roka d/o Sh. Rupia Thapa, r/o V.P.O. Rohru, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Meenu Kumari (Old Name) to Meenu Kumari Roka (New Name). All concerned please may note.

MEENU KUMARI ROKA
d/o Sh. Rupia Thapa,
r/o V.P.O. Rohru,
Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Hardesh Rana s/o Sh. Basant Rana, r/o Rana Niwas, Ward No. 7, near Chanshal Hotel, V.P.O. & Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.)-171 207 declare that I have changed my son's name from Yooven Pratap Rana (Old Name) to Yuven Rana (New Name). All concerned please may note.

HARDESH RANA
s/o Sh. Basant Rana,
r/o Rana Niwas, Ward No. 7, near Chanshal Hotel,
V.P.O. & Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Basher Chand s/o Sh. Cheparu, r/o Village Chajpur, P.O. Dhadi-Rawat, Tehsil Jubbal, District Shimla (H.P.)-171 206 declare that I have changed my name from Veshar Chand (Old Name) to Basher Chand (New Name). All concerned please may note.

BASHER CHAND
s/o Sh. Cheparu,
r/o Village Chajpur, P.O. Dhadi-Rawat,
Tehsil Jubbal, District Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sunil Kumar aged about 36 years s/o Sh. Sudama Ram, r/o Village Mali, P.O. Patka, Tehsil Sihunta, District Chamba (H.P.) declare that I have changed my son's name from Aakrit to Arkit. All concerned please may note.

SUNIL KUMAR
s/o Sh. Sudama Ram,
r/o Village Mali, P.O. Patka,
Tehsil Sihunta, District Chamba (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Khodu Ram s/o Sh. Tota, r/o Village Tharki, P.O. Surah, Tehsil Balh, District Mandi (H.P.) declare that in Aadhar Card my name is recorded as Khem Chand. My real and actual name is Khodu Ram. All concerned please may note.

KHODU RAM
s/o Sh. Tota, r/o Village Tharki,
P.O. Surah, Tehsil Balh, District Mandi (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sanika d/o Sh. Bhagmal, r/o Village Gumma, P.O. Tikkari, Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.) declare that my name is wrongly mentioned as Sonika in my Aadhar Card No. 6555 9583 5772. Therefore it should be changed to Sanika in my Aadhar Card. All concerned please may note.

SANIKA
d/o Sh. Bhagmal,
r/o Village Gumma, P.O. Tikkari,
Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Gayatri Devi d/o Sh. Resham Thapa, r/o Lana Chabiul, P.O. Dinger Kinner, Tehsil Pachhad, District Sirmaur (H.P.) due to an inadvertent mistake, the name of my son has been wrongly recorded as Ansh Kumar in his Aadhar Card but the correct and actual name of my son is Kian which has already been recorded in other Records/documects. I have changed my son's name as Kian please correct it.

GAYATRI DEVI
d/o Sh. Resham Thapa,
r/o Lana Chabiul, P.O. Dinger Kinner,
Tehsil Pachhad, District Sirmaur (H.P.).

विधि विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला–2, 31 मार्च, 2026

संख्याः एल.एल.आर.–डी.(6)–9 / 2026–लेज.–– हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल ने भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 200 के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग (संख्यांक 2) विधेयक, 2026 (2026 का विधेयक संख्यांक 3) को दिनांक 31–03–2026 को अनुमोदित कर दिया है तथा अनुच्छेद 348 के खण्ड (3) के अधीन, विधेयक के अंग्रेजी पाठ को राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत कर दिया है। अतः उपरोक्त विधेयक को वर्ष 2026 के अधिनियम संख्यांक 9 के रूप में अंग्रेजी प्राधिकृत पाठ सहित राजपत्र (ई–गजट) हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किया जाता है।

आदेश द्वारा,
हस्ताक्षरित / –
(डॉ0 विवेक ज्योति),
अतिरिक्त विधि परामर्शी एवं अतिरिक्त सचिव (विधि)।

2026 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 9.

हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग (संख्यांक 2) अधिनियम, 2026

धाराओं का क्रम

धारा :

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ।
2. हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से वित्तीय वर्ष 2026–27 के लिए ₹ 5,88,30,66,70,000 की राशि जारी करना।
3. विनियोग।
4. निरसन और व्यावृत्तियां।

अनुसूची

———————

2026 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 9.

हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग (संख्यांक 2) अधिनियम, 2026

(माननीय राज्यपाल महोदय द्वारा तारीख 31 मार्च, 2026 को यथाअनुमोदित)

वित्तीय वर्ष 2026–27 के लिए हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से सेवाओं के लिए कतिपय धनराशियों के संदाय को प्राधिकृत करने और उनका विनियोग करने के लिए **अधिनियम।**

भारत गणराज्य के सत्तहतरवें वर्ष में हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा द्वारा निम्नलिखित रूप में यह अधिनियमित हो :–

1. **संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.**––(1) इस अधिनियम का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग (संख्यांक 2) अधिनियम, 2026 है।

(2) यह प्रथम अप्रैल, 2026 को लागू होगा।

2. **हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से वित्तीय वर्ष 2026–27 के लिए ₹ 5,88,30,66,70,000 की राशि जारी करना.**––हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से **अनुसूची** के तृतीय स्तम्भ में विनिर्दिष्ट से अनधिक धनराशियां जिनका योग केवल ₹ 5,88,30,66,70,000 (अठावन हज़ार आठ सौ तीस करोड़ छियासठ लाख सत्तर हज़ार रुपए) है, संदत्त और उपयोजित की जाएं, जिनका वित्तीय वर्ष 2026–27 की अवधि में **अनुसूची** के द्वितीय स्तम्भ में विनिर्दिष्ट सेवाओं और प्रयोजनों से सम्बन्धित विभिन्न प्रभारों के संदाय को चुकाने के लिए उपयोग किया जाएगा।

3. **विनियोग.**––इस अधिनियम द्वारा हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य की संचित निधि में से संदत्त और उपयोजित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत धनराशियों का उक्त वर्ष के सम्बन्ध में अनुसूची में अभिव्यक्त सेवाओं और प्रयोजनों के लिए विनियोग किया जाएगा।

4. **निरसन और व्यावृत्तियां.**––निम्नलिखित विनिर्दिष्ट विनियोग अधिनियमों का एतद्द्वारा निरसन किया जाता है, अर्थात्:–

(i) हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग अधिनियम, 2025 (2025 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 31); और

(ii) हिमाचल प्रदेश विनियोग (संख्यांक 2) अधिनियम, 2025 (2025 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 32):

परन्तु ऐसा निरसन निम्नलिखित को प्रभावित नहीं करेगाः–

(क) किसी अन्य ऐसी अधिनियमितियों को प्रभावित नहीं करेगा जिसमें निरसित अधिनियमिति को लागू, सम्मिलित या निर्दिष्ट किया गया है; या

(ख) पहले की गई या हुई किसी बात या पहले से अर्जित या उपगत किसी अधिकार, हक, बाध्यता या दायित्व अथवा उसके विषय में किसी उपचार या कार्यवाही या किसी ऋण, शास्ति, बाध्यता, दायित्व, दावे या मांग से कोई निर्मोचन या उन्मोचन या पहले ही अनुदत्त किसी क्षतिपूर्ति या किसी पूर्व कार्य या बात के सबूत की विधिमान्यता, अविधिमान्यता, उसके प्रभाव या परिणामों पर प्रभाव नहीं डालेगा; या

(ग) विधि के किसी सिद्धान्त या नियम या स्थापित अधिकारिता, अभिवचन के प्ररूप या अनुक्रम, पद्धति या प्रक्रिया या विद्यमान विशेषाधिकार, निर्बन्धन, छूट, पद या नियुक्ति पर नहीं पड़ेगा चाहे वह, इसके द्वारा निरसित किसी अधिनियमिति द्वारा उसमें या उससे किसी रीति से पुष्ट, मान्य या व्युतपन्न क्यों न हो; या

(घ) संपरीक्षा, परीक्षण, लेखा, अन्वेषण, जांच या उससे सम्बन्धित किसी प्राधिकारी द्वारा की गई या की जाने वाली किसी अन्य कार्रवाई पर नहीं पड़ेगा और ऐसी संपरीक्षा, परीक्षण, लेखा, अन्वेषण, जांच या कार्रवाई की जा सकती है, और, या जारी रखी जा सकती है, मानो उक्त अधिनियमितियां इस अधिनियम द्वारा निरसित ही न की गई हों।

———————

अनुसूची

(धारा 2 और 3 देखें)

1	2	3		
मांग संख्या	सेवाएं और प्रयोजन	निम्नलिखित राशियों से अनधिक		
		विधान सभा द्वारा दत्तमत	संचित निधि पर प्रभारित	कुल
		₹ में	₹ में	₹ में
01	विधान सभा (राजस्व)	52,84,93,000	1,71,17,000	54,56,10,000
	(पूंजीगत)	3,15,00,000	—	3,15,00,000
02	राज्यपाल और मन्त्री परिषद् (राजस्व)	18,48,13,000	9,03,61,000	27,51,74,000
03	न्याय प्रशासन (राजस्व)	2,64,81,88,000	68,55,88,000	3,33,37,76,000
	(पूंजीगत)	4,04,00,000	—	4,04,00,000
04	सामान्य प्रशासन (राजस्व)	1,99,26,16,000	14,32,33,000	2,13,58,49,000
05	भू–राजस्व व जिला प्रशासन (राजस्व)	16,15,35,13,000	—	16,15,35,13,000

06	आबकारी और कराधान	(राजस्व)	1,23,53,75,000	—	1,23,53,75,000
07	पुलिस और सम्बद्ध संगठन	(राजस्व)	17,48,38,69,000	—	17,48,38,69,000
		(पूंजीगत)	3,38,00,000	—	3,38,00,000
08	शिक्षा	(राजस्व)	88,48,86,03,000	—	88,48,86,03,000
09	स्वास्थ्य एवं परिवार कल्याण	(राजस्व)	27,04,54,01,000	—	27,04,54,01,000
		(पूंजीगत)	35,19,14,000	—	35,19,14,000
10	लोक निर्माण– सड़क, पुल एवं भवन	(राजस्व)	24,81,76,28,000	—	24,81,76,28,000
		(पूंजीगत)	11,04,82,00,000	—	11,04,82,00,000
11	कृषि	(राजस्व)	3,38,85,53,000	—	3,38,85,53,000
		(पूंजीगत	16,05,37,000	—	16,05,37,000
12	उद्यान	(राजस्व)	3,02,93,55,000	—	3,02,93,55,000
		(पूंजीगत)	5,93,12,000	—	5,93,12,000
13	सिंचाई, जलापूर्ति एवं सफाई	(राजस्व)	23,85,39,65,000	—	23,85,39,65,000
		(पूंजीगत)	7,65,02,00,000	—	7,65,02,00,000
14	पशु पालन, दुग्ध विकास एवं मत्स्य	(राजस्व)	6,99,11,83,000	—	6,99,11,83,000
		(पूंजीगत)	24,25,39,000	—	24,25,39,000
15	योजना एवं पिछड़ा क्षेत्र विकास कार्यक्रम	(राजस्व)	1,04,20,32,000	—	1,04,20,32,000
		(पूंजीगत)	63,55,00,000	—	63,55,00,000
16	वन और वन्य जीवन	(राजस्व)	7,39,08,42,000	—	7,39,08,42,000
17	निर्वाचन	(राजस्व)	46,33,09,000	—	46,33,09,000
18	उद्योग, खनिज, आपूर्ति एवं सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी	(राजस्व)	75,34,35,000	—	75,34,35,000
19	सामाजिक न्याय एवं अधिकारिता	(राजस्व)	12,84,26,20,000	—	12,84,26,20,000
		(पूंजीगत)	10,56,00,000	—	10,56,00,000
20	ग्रामीण विकास	(राजस्व)	16,86,27,46,000	—	16,86,27,46,000
21	सहकारिता	(राजस्व)	48,80,97,000	—	48,80,97,000
22	खाद्य और नागरिक आपूर्ति	(राजस्व)	1,09,76,92,000	—	1,09,76,92,000
23	विद्युत विकास	(राजस्व)	2,07,99,92,000	—	2,07,99,92,000
		(पूंजीगत)	42,90,00,000	—	42,90,00,000
24	मुद्रण एवं लेखन सामग्री	(राजस्व)	22,21,61,000	—	22,21,61,000

25	सड़क और जल परिवहन	(राजस्व)	2,59,70,62,000	—	2,59,70,62,000
		(पूंजीगत)	23,01,00,000	—	23,01,00,000
26	पर्यटन और नागर विमानन	(राजस्व)	78,17,78,000	—	78,17,78,000
		(पूंजीगत)	1,97,43,00,000	—	1,97,43,00,000
27	श्रम, रोजगार और प्रशिक्षण	(राजस्व)	3,34,34,53,000	—	3,34,34,53,000
		(पूंजीगत)	32,00,000	—	32,00,000
28	शहरी विकास, नगर एवं ग्राम योजना तथा आवास	(राजस्व)	4,14,55,10,000	—	4,14,55,10,000
		(पूंजीगत)	39,49,00,000	—	39,49,00,000
29	वित्त	(राजस्व)	1,21,08,86,09,000	72,71,94,91,000	1,93,80,81,00,000
		(पूंजीगत)	1,80,02,000	48,40,39,32,000	48,42,19,34,000
30	विविध सामान्य सेवाएं	(राजस्व)	1,03,06,19,000	—	1,03,06,19,000
31	जनजातीय क्षेत्र विकास कार्यक्रम	(राजस्व)	16,44,22,20,000	—	16,44,22,20,000
		(पूंजीगत)	2,53,57,00,000	—	2,53,57,00,000
32	अनुसूचित जाति विकास कार्यक्रम	(राजस्व)	22,01,86,14,000	—	22,01,86,14,000
		(पूंजीगत)	7,76,98,98,000	—	7,76,98,98,000
	जोड़	**(राजस्व)**	**4,32,53,23,46,000**	**73,65,57,90,000**	**5,06,18,81,36,000**
		(पूंजीगत)	**33,71,46,02,000**	**48,40,39,32,000**	**82,11,85,34,000**
		कुल जोड़	**4,66,24,69,48,000**	**1,22,05,97,22,000**	**5,88,30,66,70,000**

————————

AUTHORITATIVE ENGLISH TEXT

Act No. 9 of 2026

THE HIMACHAL PRADESH APPROPRIATION (NUMBER 2) ACT, 2026

ARRANGEMENT OF SECTIONS

Sections:

1. Short title and commencement.
2. Issue of a sum of ₹5,88,30,66,70,000 out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh for the financial year 2026-2027.
3. Appropriation.
4. Repeal and savings.

THE SCHEDULE

————————

Act No. 9 of 2026

THE HIMACHAL PRADESH APPROPRIATION (NUMBER 2) ACT, 2026

(AS ASSENTED TO BY THE GOVERNOR ON 31ST MARCH, 2026)

AN

ACT

to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh for the services for the financial year 2026-27.

BE it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of Himachal Pradesh in the Seventy-seventh Year of the Republic of India as follows:—

1. Short title and commencement.—(1) This Act may be called the Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (Number 2) Act, 2026.

(2) It shall come into force on the first day of April, 2026.

2. Issue of a sum of ₹ 5,88,30,66,70,000 out of the Consolidated fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh for the financial year 2026-2027.—From and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State ofHimachal Pradesh, there may be paid and applied sums not exceeding those specified in column (3) of THE SCHEDULE amounting in the aggregate to a sum of ₹ 5,88,30,66,70,000 (Rupees fifty eight thousand eight hundred thirty crore sixty six lakh seventy thousand) only towards defraying the several charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year 2026-2027 in respect of the services and purposes specified in column (2) of THE SCHEDULE.

3. Appropriation.—The sum authorized to be paid and applied from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Himachal Pradesh by this Act shall be appropriated for the services and purposes expressed in THE SCHEDULE in relation to the said year.

4. Repeal and savings.—The Appropriation Acts specified below are hereby repealed, namely:—

(i) The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation Act, 2025 (Act No. 31 of 2025); and

(ii) The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (Number 2) Act, 2025 (Act No. 32 of 2025):

Provided that such repeal shall not,—

(a) affect any other enactment in which the repealed enactment has been applied, incorporated or referred to; or

(b) affect the validity, invalidity, effect or consequences of anything already done or suffered, or any right, title, obligation or liability already acquired or incurred or any remedy or proceeding in respect thereof, or any release or discharge of or from any debt, penalty, obligation, liability, claim or demand, or indemnity already granted, or the proof of any past act or thing; or

(c) affect any principle or rule of law, or established jurisdiction, form or course of pleading, practice or procedure, or existing privilege, restriction, exemption, office or appointment, notwithstanding that the same respectively may have been in any manner affirmed or recognized or derived by, in or from any enactment thereby repealed; or

(d) affect the audit, examination, accounting, investigation, inquiry or any other action taken or to be taken in relation thereto by any authority and such audit, examination, accounting, investigation, inquiry or action could be taken, and, or continued as if the said enactments are not repealed by this Act.

THE SCHEDULE

(*See* sections 2 and 3)

1	2		3		
Demand No.	Services and Purposes		Sums not exceeding		
			Voted by the Legislative Assembly	Charged on the Consolidated Fund	Total
			in ₹	in ₹	in ₹
01	Vidhan Sabha	(Revenue)	52,84,93,000	1,71,17,000	54,56,10,000
		(Capital)	3,15,00,000	-	3,15,00,000
02	Governor and Council of Ministers	(Revenue)	18,48,13,000	9,03,61,000	27,51,74,000
03	Administration of Justice	(Revenue)	2,64,81,88,000	68,55,88,000	3,33,37,76,000
		(Capital)	4,04,00,000	-	4,04,00,000
04	General Administration	(Revenue)	1,99,26,16,000	14,32,33,000	2,13,58,49,000
05	Land Revenue and District Administration	(Revenue)	16,15,35,13,000	-	16,15,35,13,000
06	Excise and Taxation	(Revenue)	1,23,53,75,000	-	1,23,53,75,000
07	Police and Allied Organisations	(Revenue)	17,48,38,69,000	-	17,48,38,69,000
		(Capital)	3,38,00,000	-	3,38,00,000
08	Education	(Revenue)	88,48,86,03,000	-	88,48,86,03,000
09	Health and Family Welfare	(Revenue)	27,04,54,01,000	-	27,04,54,01,000
		(Capital)	35,19,14,000	-	35,19,14,000
10	Public Works-Roads, Bridges and Buildings	(Revenue)	24,81,76,28,000	-	24,81,76,28,000
		(Capital)	11,04,82,00,000	-	11,04,82,00,000
11	Agriculture	(Revenue)	3,38,85,53,000	-	3,38,85,53,000
		(Capital)	16,05,37,000	-	16,05,37,000

12	Horticulture	(Revenue)	3,02,93,55,000	-	3,02,93,55,000
		(Capital)	5,93,12,000	-	5,93,12,000
13	Irrigation, Water Supply and Sanitation	(Revenue)	23,85,39,65,000	-	23,85,39,65,000
		(Capital)	7,65,02,00,000	-	7,65,02,00,000
14	Animal Husbandry, Dairy Development and Fisheries	(Revenue)	6,99,11,83,000	-	6,99,11,83,000
		(Capital)	24,25,39,000	-	24,25,39,000
15	Planning and Backward Area Development Programme	(Revenue)	1,04,20,32,000	-	1,04,20,32,000
		(Capital)	63,55,00,000	-	63,55,00,000
16	Forest and Wild Life	(Revenue)	7,39,08,42,000	-	7,39,08,42,000
17	Election	(Revenue)	46,33,09,000	-	46,33,09,000
18	Industries, Minerals, Supplies and Information Technology	(Revenue)	75,34,35,000	-	75,34,35,000
19	Social Justice and Empowerment	(Revenue)	12,84,26,20,000	-	12,84,26,20,000
		(Capital)	10,56,00,000	-	10,56,00,000
20	Rural Development	(Revenue)	16,86,27,46,000	-	16,86,27,46,000
21	Co-operation	(Revenue)	48,80,97,000	-	48,80,97,000
22	Food and Civil Supplies	(Revenue)	1,09,76,92,000	-	1,09,76,92,000
23	Power Development	(Revenue)	2,07,99,92,000	-	2,07,99,92,000
		(Capital)	42,90,00,000	-	42,90,00,000
24	Printing and Stationery	(Revenue)	22,21,61,000	-	22,21,61,000
25	Road and Water Transport	(Revenue)	2,59,70,62,000	-	2,59,70,62,000
		(Capital)	23,01,00,000	-	23,01,00,000
26	Tourism and Civil Aviation	(Revenue)	78,17,78,000	-	78,17,78,000
		(Capital)	1,97,43,00,000	-	1,97,43,00,000
27	Labour, Employment and Training	(Revenue)	3,34,34,53,000	-	3,34,34,53,000
		(Capital)	32,00,000	-	32,00,000
28	Urban Development, Town and Country Planning and Housing	(Revenue)	4,14,55,10,000	-	4,14,55,10,000
		(Capital)	39,49,00,000	-	39,49,00,000
29	Finance	(Revenue)	1,21,08,86,09,000	72,71,94,91,000	1,93,80,81,00,000
		(Capital)	1,80,02,000	48,40,39,32,000	48,42,19,34,000
30	Miscellaneous General Services	(Revenue)	1,03,06,19,000	-	1,03,06,19,000

31	Tribal Area Development Programme	(Revenue)	16,44,22,20,000	-	16,44,22,20,000
		(Capital)	2,53,57,00,000	-	2,53,57,00,000
32	Scheduled Castes Development Programme	(Revenue)	22,01,86,14,000	-	22,01,86,14,000
		(Capital)	7,76,98,98,000	-	7,76,98,98,000
		Total (Revenue)	**4,32,53,23,46,000**	**73,65,57,90,000**	**5,06,18,81,36,000**
		(Capital)	**33,71,46,02,000**	**48,40,39,32,000**	**82,11,85,34,000**
		Grand Total	**4,66,24,69,48,000**	**1,22,05,97,22,000**	**5,88,30,66,70,000**

पंचायती राज विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला–171 009, 30 मार्च, 2026

संख्या: पीसीएच-एचए(1)18/2008-III-15389-489.—इस विभाग की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना तारीख 13 मार्च, 2026 के अन्तर्गत, हिमाचल प्रदेश पंचायती राज निर्वाचन संशोधन नियम , 2026 का प्रारूप, हिमाचल प्रदेश पंचायती राज अधिनियम, 1994 (1994 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 4) की धारा 186 की उप-धारा (3) के उपबन्धों के अधीन यथा अपेक्षित, जन साधारण से आक्षेप और सुझाव आमन्त्रित करने के लिए राजपत्र (ई-गजट) हिमाचल प्रदेश में तारीख 13 मार्च, 2026 को प्रकाशित किया गया था;

ये नियम अंतिम रूप से राजपत्र ई-गजट हिमाचल प्रदेश में तारीख 23-03-2026 को प्रकाशित हुए थे, परंतु इन नियमों की बावत प्राप्त हुए आक्षेपों पर त्रुटिवश विचार नहीं किया जा सका;

इस बाबत प्राप्त हुए आक्षेपों पर सरकार द्वारा विचार किया गया और तारीख 23-03-2026 को उपांतरित नियमों के अतिक्रमण में तदनुसार नियमों को उपांतरित करने का भी विनिश्चय किया गया।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश पंचायती राज अधिनियम, 1994 (1994 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 4) की धारा 183 और 186 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, अधिसूचना संख्या पीसीएच एचए-(3) 6/94, तारीख 7 फरवरी, 1995 द्वारा अधिसूचित और तारीख 8 फरवरी, 1995 को अधिसूचित और राजपत्र (असाधारण) हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित हिमाचल प्रदेश पंचायती राज (निर्वाचन) नियम, 1994 का और संशोधन करने के लिए अधिसूचना संख्या पीसीएच – एचए (1) 18/2008 तारीख 21-03-2026 (ई-गजट, हिमाचल प्रदेश में तारीख 23-03-2026 को प्रकाशित) के अतिक्रमण में निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात्:-

नियम

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारंभ	(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश पंचायती राज (निर्वाचन) संशोधन नियम, 2026 है । (2) ये नियम राजपत्र (ई-गजट), हिमाचल प्रदेश में उनके प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. नियम 28 का संशोधन	हिमाचल प्रदेश पंचायती राज (निर्वाचन) नियम, 1994 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् "उक्त नियम" कहा गया है) के नियम 28 में उप-नियम (8-क) के पश्चात निम्नलिखित परंतुक अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:— ''परन्तु उपायुक्त के पास भौगोलिक और अन्य विचित्र स्थितियों के दृष्टिगत पंचायत के कुल स्थानों के अधिकतम 5% तक पंचायत के सदस्यों के रोस्टर में परिवर्तन करने की शक्ति होगी''
3. नियम 87 का संशोधन	उक्त नियमों के नियम 87 में उप-नियम (8-क) के पश्चात निम्नलिखित परंतुक अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:— "परंतु उपायुक्त के पास भौगोलिक और अन्य विचित्र स्थितियों के दृष्टिगत प्रधानो के कुल पदों के अधिकतम 5% तक ग्राम पंचायतों के प्रधानों के रोस्टर में परिवर्तन करने की शक्ति होगी"
4. नियम 88 का संशोधन	उक्त नियमों के नियम 88 में उप-नियम (8-क) के पश्चात निम्नलिखित परंतुक अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:— "परंतु उपायुक्त के पास भौगोलिक और अन्य विचित्र स्थितियों के दृष्टिगत जिला में अध्यक्षों के कुल पदों के अधिकतम 5% तक पंचायत समितियों के अध्यक्ष के रोस्टर में परिवर्तन करने की शक्ति होगी"

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सचिव (पंचायती राज)।

[Authoritative English Text of this Department Notification No. PCH-HA(1)18/2008-III, dated 30-03-2026 as required under clause(3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].

PANCHAYATI RAJ DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-09, the 30th March, 2026

No. PCH-HA (1)18/2008-III-15389-489.—Whereas, the draft Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj (Election) Amendment Rules, 2026 were notified *vide* this department notification of even number dated 13-03-2026 and published in Rajpatra(e-gazette) of Himachal Pradesh on dated 13-03-2026 for inviting objection(s) and suggestion(s) from general public as required under sub-section (3) of Section 186 of Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (Act No. 4 of 1994);

And whereas, these rules were finally published in Rajpatra (e-gazette) of Himachal Pradesh on dated 23-03-2026. But the objections received on these rules could not be considered inadvertently.

And whereas, objections received in this regard were considered by the Government and it was decided to modify the rules accordingly by superseding the rules notified on 23-03-2026.

Now, therefore, after considering objections and in exercise of the powers conferred by Sections 183 and 186 of the Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (Act No. 4 of 1994), the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to make the following rules in supersession to the notification No. PCH-HA(1)18/2008, dated 21-03-2026 (Published in Rajpatra e-gazette on 23-03-2026) further to amend the Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj (Election) Rules, 1994, notified *vide* this Department notification No. PCH-HA (3) 6/94, dated 7th February, 1995 and published in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh (Extra-ordinary) on 8th February, 1995, namely:—

1. Short title and commencement	(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj (Election) Amendment Rules, 2026. (2) These rules shall come into force from the date of their publication in Rajpatra (e-Gazette), Himachal Pradesh.
2. Amendment of rule 28	In rule 28 of H.P. Panchayati Raj (Election) Rules, 1994 (hereinafter referred to as the 'said rules') after sub-rule (8-A), the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:— *"Provided that the Deputy Commissioner shall have power to change the roster of members of panchayats upto maximum of 5% of the total seats in a panchayat in view of geographical and other peculiar conditions".*
3. Amendment of rule 87	In rule 87 of the 'said rules' after sub-rule (8-A), the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:— "*Provided that the Deputy Commissioner shall have power to change the roster of Pradhans of gram panchayats upto maximum of 5% of the total offices of Pradhans in a Block in view of geographical and other peculiar conditions".*
4. Amendment of rule 88	In rule 88 of the 'said rules' after sub-rule (8-A), the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:— "*Provided that the Deputy Commissioner shall have power to change the roster of Chairman of Panchayat Samities upto maximum of 5% of the total offices of Chairpersons in a district in view of geographical and other peculiar conditions".*

Sd/-
Secretary,
(Panchayati Raj).

शहरी विकास विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला–02, 31 मार्च, 2026

संख्याः यू0डी0–ए0(3)–4 / 2024–रूल्स–लूज.––हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश नगर निगम अधिनियम, 1994 (1994 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 12) की धारा 31 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इस विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या यू0डी0–ए0 (3)–7 / 2011, तारीख 23–3–2012 द्वारा अधिसूचित और राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में तारीख 24–03–2012 को प्रकाशित हिमाचल प्रदेश नगर निगम (निर्वाचन) नियम, 2012 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं; अर्थात् :–

1. **संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.––**(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश नगर निगम निर्वाचन (संशोधन) नियम, 2026 है।

(2) ये नियम राजपत्र (ई–गजट) में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. **नियम 10 का संशोधन.––**हिमाचल प्रदेश नगर निगम (निर्वाचन) नियम, 2012 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (5) के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित परन्तुक अंतस्थापित किए जाएंगे, अर्थातः–

"परन्तु यदि निगम क्षेत्र के किसी वार्ड में अनुसूचित जातियों या अनुसूचित जनजातियों की कुल जनसंख्या वार्ड की कुल जनसंख्या के 25 प्रतिशत से कम है, तो वह वार्ड ऐसी श्रेणी के लिए आरक्षित नहीं होगा।

परन्तु यह और कि यह प्रतिबंध उन मामलों में लागू नहीं होगा, जहां ऐसी सीट का आरक्षण न करने के परिणामस्वरूप, इस अधिनियम और इन नियमों के तहत किसी भी श्रेणी के लिए निर्धारित आरक्षण प्रतिशत की पूर्ति नहीं हो जाती।"

आदेश द्वारा,

(देवेश कुमार),
प्रधान सचिव (शहरी विकास)।

[Authoritative English Text of this Department's notification number UD-A(3)-14/2024-Rules, dated 31-03-2026 as required under article 348(3) of the Constitution of India].

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171002, the 31st March, 2026

No. UD-A(3)-14/2024-Rules.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 31 of the Himachal Pradesh Municipal Corporation Act, 1994 (Act No. 12 of 1994), the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, makes the following Rules further to amend the Himachal Pradesh Municipal Corporation Election Rules, 2012 notified *vide* this Department Notification No. UD-A(3)-7/2011, dated 23-03-2012 and published in Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh on 24-03-2012, namely:—

1. Short title and commencement.—(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Municipal Corporation Election (Amendment) Rules, 2026.

(2) These rules shall come into force from the date of publication in Rajpatra (e-Gazette), Himachal Pradesh.

2. Amendment in Rule 10.—In rule 10 of the Himachal Pradesh Municipal Corporation Election Rules, 2012, after the sub-rule (5) , following provisos shall be inserted; namely:—

"Provided that if *the total population of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes in a ward of the Corporation area is less than 25% of the total population of the ward, then that ward shall not be reserved for such category.*

Provided further that this restriction shall not apply where non-reservation of such seat would result in non fulfilment of the prescribed percentage of reservation of any category under the Act and these rules."

By order,

DEVESH KUMAR,
Principal Secretary (UD).

नियन्त्रक, मुद्रण तथा लेखन सामग्री, हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला–5 द्वारा मुद्रित तथा प्रकाशित
इलेक्ट्रॉनिक हस्ताक्षरित राजपत्र, वैबसाइट https://rajpatra.hp.gov.in पर उपलब्ध है एवम् ऑनलाइन सत्यापित किया जा सकता है।